THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 4. JULY, 1931. Vol. XXI.

ANGLICAN DOCTRINAL REVISION

By the Right Rev. E. W. Barnes, D.D., D.Sc., F.R.S., Bishop of Birmingham.

IN their origin the Articles of Religion represent the Reformation settlement. They were the outcome of the religious struggles of the first half of the sixteenth century. They are, therefore, emphatic in their repudiation of mediaeval sacramental theory, formulated as transubstantiation, and of ecclesiastical infallibility. Naturally they reflect the knowledge of their time. Just as the so-called Nicene Creed represents the general Christian outlook of the Fourth Century, so the Thirty-Nine Articles represent Christian doctrine as reformulated under the influence of that great period of intellectual ferment known as the Renaissance. I would go further and say that just as the Renaissance was nearer to our modern outlook than was the thought of the era of decline of Greco-Roman civilization, so the Articles, in spite of their unfamiliarity, are more modern in spirit than the Creeds. Further, the Articles are still the authoritative standard of doctrine of the Church of England.

What now is the nature of the assent which one of our ministers must give to Articles and Creeds? It is designedly vague, for it was deliberately relaxed in the second half of last century. At the present time an ordinand merely assents to the Articles and to the Book of Common Prayer and declares that the doctrine set forth 'is agreeable to the Word of God.' Here it will be noted that Articles and Prayer Book are placed on a level. Further, the doctrine in them is not asserted to be true: it is merely agreeable to the Word of God. Further, by the

Eighth Article the Creeds are to be received because they can be proved by Holy Scripture. The basis of the whole system is thus the Word of God, especially as that Word is revealed in Scripture. It follows that just in so far as we allow freedom of opinion with regard to Scripture, so we must allow it with regard to Articles, Prayer Book, and Creeds. Finally, I would remind you that the clergy of our Church are not obliged to have a belief in our Creeds more definite than that of its laity.

None can fail to be aware that of recent months there has been launched a vigorous campaign against the Articles. We witness, in fact, the beginning of that movement for doctrinal re-adjustment within the Church which Archbishop Davidson foresaw and which, in his private opinion, was likely to be more difficult and divisive than anything in his own anxious experience.

Now personally I view with much concern the present proposals to change or repudiate our Articles of Religion. These Articles emphasize the reformed character of our doctrine. They protect us from sub-Christian sacramental teaching. Though such change as is advocated might be begun with the ostensible object of giving relief to tender consciences, I am certain that we should find at the end that sacramental truth had been abandoned. Already there has been a virtual repudiation of the doctrinal position of the Articles in negotiations with the Orthodox Church and the Old Catholics. In defence of such action it is urged that we ought to make alliances with these bodies that there may be, in political language, a *bloc* to oppose the Roman Church. I distrust these politico-ecclesiastical negotiations. When ecclesiastical politics enter by the door, religion flies out of the window. I am more concerned to preserve religious truth and Christian morality than to construct ecclesiastical alliances. The sacramental doctrine alike of the Orthodox Church and of the Old Catholics is unscriptural and untrue; and, moreover, the moral witness of the Orthodox Church in Russia and the Eastern Mediterranean has left, and still leaves, much to be desired.

I turn to the plea that able men are to-day repelled by the Articles. My comment on this argument is that I was for many years a Cambridge Tutor, and I learned that to most men the Creeds were the stumbling-block to Ordination: the Articles

barely entered into their field of vision. I have reason to know that to-day this fact remains true.

The majority of men who now go to the older Universities receive scholarships or grants of aid to enable their powers to be properly trained. The most able boys of the community from almost all social classes thus receive the best education that the country can give. Unfortunately, the percentage of these boys who seek ordination is deplorably small. We are often told that there is a great reservoir from which we can draw suitable ordinands if only funds for their training are forthcoming. I can only comment that in any such reservoir there is little first-class ability. A Church needs in its ministry men of all types: character and energy and religious enthusiasm are as important as intellectual power. But a Church whose ministers are largely destitute of intellectual capacity will not prove able to guide or lead a modern democracy. We still have in the ministry men of spiritual vision and mental strength. In this diocese these are, I think, especially numerous. But in the Church as a whole the decline in the intellectual and moral authority of the clergy during the last half-century has been serious. If recent decay is not arrested, we cannot look forward hopefully to the future.

Now we must acknowledge with regret that, on the one hand, many of the able men whom we would wish to see in the Church or its ministry do not accept the Christian position. Their standpoint is normally a humane agnosticism or the more positive non-theistic humanism which is at present so influential in the United States of America. Until the tide changes we cannot hope to gain the allegiance of such men. I personally think that their standpoint cannot be preferred to Christian theism: and I believe that the arguments of the report entitled *The Christian Doctrine of God*, issued by the Lambeth Conference of 1930, are valid against agnostic and non-theistic positions. But, on the other hand, there are many able men who take the main position of that Report: they accept Christian theism. But they are nevertheless alienated by the Creeds. Such men adopt an attitude towards miracles which is the outcome of modern scientific investigation. They do not deny that God in His omnipotence can work miracles. But they assert that such abnormal physico-biological phenomena as are usually termed miracles do not

occur in human experience. They are not prepared to base religion on such events as may have occurred in the past, for they hold them to be doubtful and, at most, only indirect signs of spiritual realities that can be otherwise perceived. Such men naturally think that the Creeds work too much with physical and biological categories. Their standpoint is often misunderstood. There are, for instance, many traditionalist Christians who hold that the truth of the Incarnation is dependent upon the fact of the Virgin Birth. There is, of course, no such necessary dependence. St. Paul preached God Incarnate in Christ without mentioning the Virgin Birth. Personally I regard the Creeds not as verbally infallible in both religion and science, but as witnesses to spiritual truth. For instance, the three-storey picture of heaven, earth and hell implied in the Apostles' Creed is to be rejected because it belongs to the obsolete thought of those among whom it arose. Like many other Bishops I demand from ordinands as regards the person of Christ no more than that they should accept the truth of the Incarnation of God in Christ, Who is alive for evermore and to Whom the Holy Spirit continually witnesses in the highest moral and spiritual illumination of humanity. I would have you notice that what I thus demand is a quite definite creed, for I believe that we cannot exist without a creed. However, this creed, while it maintains what I conceive to be vital in the so-called Nicene and Athanasian formulae, is as it were a spiritual essence distilled from them. But this spiritual essence requires to be supplemented. We need, for instance, the affirmation of such an important Christian belief as the doctrine of personal immortality. I would further add that no creed can be satisfactory which does not formulate Christ's emphasis on purity and peace as it occurs in the Beatitudes: those great sayings occupy far too unimportant a place in our liturgy. Thus I desire to see a new type of creed arise. If and when it comes we shall also, as I believe, need Articles to repudiate errors, modern no less than ancient, and to affirm philosophical and psychological truths such as the moral freedom of the individual. But I will not elaborate in detail the positions which reformed Articles ought in my own opinion to affirm or reject. But of this I am convinced, that any doctrinal reform in our Church ought to be expressed by the concurrent

redrafting alike of our Articles and of our Creeds. I add the warning that if the reform is so carried out as tacitly to admit errors which the Eastern Orthodox Church retains in its sacramental doctrine, our last state will be worse than our present. In conclusion I would say that if and when our Church seriously enters on the task of doctrinal revision, three principles should be accepted by those who attempt what of necessity will be a formidable task. First, we ought not to reject the Reformation, but to build upon it. Secondly, we ought not to quarrel with modern knowledge, but to accept it. Thirdly, we ought not to pretend to find perfect and final truth in some old-time formula, but continually to listen to the Holy Spirit Who not only inspired Holy Scripture, but Who still speaks by His prophets.

A VICTORIAN DEAN AND THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

By Canon H. J. Palmer, M.A., Canon Emeritus of Ripon.

IT is opportune, when we are called upon to celebrate the Centenary of the Oxford Movement, to have presented to us a new and very interesting life of Dean Stanley by the Dean of Windsor and Hector Bolitho,[1] to be reminded of the vitality and growth of the Liberal Movement in the Catholic Church, and especially to be reminded of those who in the days of stress and storm stood firm and defended those fundamental, comprehensive principles which the narrowing influences of the Oxford Movement endangered.

We are not blind to the revival of religion which was brought about by the God-inspired men who founded the Oxford Movement. The extent and importance of this Revival has not suffered from want of recognition: its biographers have been numerous, sympathetic, and learned. In the popular religious mind of to-day, the names of Newman, Pusey, and Keble stand out as the saviours of the definite faith of the Church.

Nonconformists have given their tribute and acknowledged their debt to the Movement, which incidentally cut them off

[1] *A Victorian Dean*, a Memoir of Arthur Stanley, Dean of Westminster. Edited by the Dean of Windsor and Hector Bolitho. Published by Chatto and Windus (1930).

ecclesiastically from the Catholic Church; and the Romanists have welcomed with loud acclamation the return to the true fold of the many distinguished Churchmen, including two Cardinals, which the Movement has brought to them in a steady and increasing stream.

But the names of those who stood for a wider Catholicity and were not overborne by the narrower Movement are in danger of being overlooked. If it had not been for the Liberalism of Dr. Arnold and his great disciple, Arthur P. Stanley, the more comprehensive expression of the Church would have been silenced in the earlier stages of the Movement.

It needed a strong opposition to the non-critical and non-social limitations of the Oxford Movement to keep the door open for the wider and more scientific development of the Faith which was to follow. As Stanley used to say: How different might have been the course of the Church of England if Newman had been able to read German! And we might add what a difference it would have made to Christian civilization, if Newman had devoted his high intellectual powers to the service of the State, instead of confining his interests solely to the advance and revival of the Catholic Church, in opposition to the Liberalism he so greatly feared!

In looking back to 1833, when Keble preached his famous sermon on National Apostasy in the University Church, it seems incomprehensible that the occasion which is held to have started the Oxford Movement should have been confined to the fear of State encroachments on the prerogative of the Church without making any reference to the alarming condition of the working-classes, whose unrecognized demands and claims were soon to bring about an apostasy from the Church of a more far-reaching kind. It makes clear in what a purely academic atmosphere the Oxford Movement arose, that so great a disturbance should have moved the University to the depths about matters which, after all, were only of limited interest and importance to the outside world.

At a time when the old abuses of the nation were crying aloud for adjustment; when reform was in the air and a Reform Bill maturing; when the Industrial Revolution had brought about an entirely new situation in the social life of the

country; when the cry of the little children held in the slavery of the pits and mills was piteous and deplorable, Oxford was taken up with Church controversies, while the nation was sunk in squalor and poverty. In 'the hungry forties' the people were crying out for bread and freedom, and the Oxford Movement regarded other matters as much more important—it offered to the starving a stone instead of bread.

What was the Church doing in so grave a national crisis? Fighting about Apostolic Succession and the meaning of Sacraments, opposing electoral reform and supporting the rich as against the poor! What a different position the Church would have been in now had its leaders taken action on behalf of the down-trodden workers in the dark days of the Industrial Revolution! The national apostasy from organized religion which has since taken place might have been avoided, and the ideals of the Labour Party might have been working inside instead of outside the Church. What a great opportunity Mr. Keble missed when, in a clerical frame of mind, he discussed National Apostasy only from an ecclesiastical point of view.

As Dr. Arnold wrote of the national distress at this period:

> 'I cannot understand what is the good of a National Church, if it be not to Christianize the nation, and introduce the principles of Christianity into men's social and civil relations, and expose the wickedness of that spirit which maintains the game laws, and in agriculture and trade seems to think that there is no such sin as covetousness, and that if a man is not dishonest, he has nothing to do but to make all the profit of his capital that he can.'

Stanley was fully imbued with the spirit and teaching of his great master, of whom he testified: 'What a wonderful influence he has had on my mind! I certainly feel that I have hardly a free will of my own on any subject about which he has written or spoken.' And he gives the most touching account of his parting at Rugby with his great schoolmaster when he had to leave for Oxford:

> 'I went to take leave of the Arnolds, with as heavy a heart as was compatible with the relief of all being over and the joy of so good a settlement. He was going out, so I saw him only for a few minutes, but those minutes were worth much.'

He describes the brief conversation, the look and voice of his master:

> 'Speaking in that low, choked voice . . . of his, saying how sorry he was to lose me: "God bless you, Stanley," he said. "Here and

> hereafter let me see you and hear from you as often as you can." And so we parted.'

At Oxford, Stanley saw with the eyes and heard with the ears of Arnold, and the Oxford Movement created a strange and disturbing environment with which he could not be, and never was, reconciled. His first impressions of Keble and Pusey and Newman are interesting to record. Of the former he writes:

> 'His lecture was in Latin, and I only heard a long argument in part rather fine and true, but in part certainly most curious and thoroughly downright Tory—in words as plain as Latin can express it.'

And of Newman he wrote, quoting Lake, 'his is rather like the picture of Louis XI in the early edition of *Quentin Durward*.' And further:

> 'The point that most occupies my mind just now is Newman. I heard him preach in the Parish Church on Sunday. There were things that reminded me that he was the High Churchman. But the general tone, the manner, the simple language, reminded me of no other than Arnold. There was the same overpowering conviction conveyed that he was a thorough Christian—I had almost said, a man of the purest charity. . . . At present Arnold and Newman seem to be almost antagonistical powers, whereas really they are of the very same essence, so to speak.

It was in that same notable year, 1833, when Stanley obtained his scholarship at Balliol, that he wrote to his sister: 'You may only think of my joy: the honour of Rugby is saved, and I am a scholar of Balliol.'

Stanley was suspect in Oxford because of his adherence to the Liberalism of his master, and in consequence was warned off from a Balliol Fellowship to become a Fellow of University College.

How robust was Arnold's Liberalism in the political crisis of the time may be seen in a letter written by him to Stanley in 1835:

> 'Search and look whether you can find that any Constitution was ever destroyed from within by factions and discontent, without its destruction having been, either just penalty, or necessary, because it could no longer answer its proper purposes. And this ripeness for destruction is the sure consequence of Toryism and Conservatism, or of that base system which joins the hand of the Reformer to the heart of the Tory, not upon principle, but upon demand; and therefore both changes and preserves amiss, alike blind and low-principled in what it gives and in what it withholds.'

In Stanley's *Life of Dr. Arnold* it is plain that the Liberalism which frightened Pusey and stirred the Oxford Movement was

very real and thorough-going, both ecclesiastically and politically.

When we turn to the earlier pages of *A Victorian Dean* for evidences of Stanley's connection with, and opposition to, the aim of the Oxford Movement, we observe that the Introduction speaks of him

> 'as unique in his generation and, in the midst of the controversies and theological storms of the Oxford Movement and the fear that followed, he preached by his life the Christian truths which cannot be assailed by changing theological theories. . . . His religion was so certain that it grew, but never changed its character from the day when he sat under the pulpit and heard Arnold preach at Rugby.'

In the second chapter:

> 'While he grew as a scholar, he was perpetually distressed by the theological dissensions at Oxford, and as he took on the work of the College Tutor, his letters are heavy with the stories of Newman's growth and leadership, Pusey's sermons, the Hampden agitation, and the story of Ward's degradation. Stanley went to hear Ward avow his belief in the whole cycle of Roman doctrines, and wrote his lamentations that a mob of twelve hundred parsons should assume judicial functions, after the most solemn warnings of their incompetency, on a question which it is quite impossible they can have studied. "What are you going to do?" an old clergyman was heard to say to another. "Oh, I don't know—vote for the old Church, I suppose. Come and have a supper afterwards."'

When back at Oxford after a visit to Germany, he wrote of the contrast to Bonn and Heidelberg, and added: 'I don't wonder that amidst these massive grey colleges Newman delights in thinking that he is clinging to the only fragment left us of the ancient Catholic Church.'

When his father was appointed Bishop of Norwich, Stanley too realized a fuller life and wider influence, for he became his father's adviser in many things. Indeed, his father's installation sermon, which was far from being calm and unobtrusive, owed many of its surprises to the undergraduate at Oxford:

> 'I am always afraid of anything about the Roman Catholics: the relations of the Church of England to them are so very complicated, that it requires more subtlety and accuracy of expression than almost any other question.'

At the time of his ordination, he wrote to his friend Pearson, who was also to be ordained at the same time:

> 'It is a great privilege to be a Minister of the Church, but it is a far greater privilege to be a member of it: he who most magnifies the solemnity of Baptism, will most rightly value the far inferior solemnity of Ordination.'

His appointment as Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford called forth a characteristic correspondence with Dr. Pusey, which clearly sets forth the difference of view of the two men, the one leading and the other opposing the Movement. Dr. Pusey wrote to him :

> 'Loving you personally, I was grieved not to be able to congratulate you on your appointment. But I viewed it with sorrow and fear. I am sure that, whatever ground your and Professor Jowett's pupils occupy, it will not be yours. It must be onward or backward. I have said to Professor Jowett that I could not hold his faith for an hour. Intellectually he is, I am sure, inconsistent, and although in some way his religious policy enables him, I suppose, not to push things to their results, with his pupils it must be different. Pupils see the inconsistency, and either follow our theories to their consequences, or give up the theory. But actual unbelief has made frightful inroads already. . . . In *Sinai and Palestine* I see the shrinking from the mention of Miracles, which, in the next generation, develops into the unbelief of them. The reports that I have heard of your lecture on Abraham were very distressing to me.'

To which Stanley replied :

> 'First, as I know that you have greatly misunderstood what my friend, Professor Jowett, has said on one class of subjects, so I think that you may have misunderstood what I have said, or have been reported to have said, on a different class of subjects.
>
> Secondly, I would beg very respectfully, but seriously, to suggest to you the fears which you express respecting the tendency of the teaching of those from whom you differ are the very same which are entertained by many excellent persons respecting the tendency of the teaching of those with whom you agree. I do not doubt that your teaching, which by many is thought so dangerous and necessarily conducing to results that you would greatly deprecate, is to some amongst us the best stay of their faith. But I am no less sure that the teaching of those whom you dread may be, and is, the best stay of the faith of others who, if your teaching were the sole alternative, would be driven into utter unbelief. . . . I am anxious to believe that we shall have always the same object in view, namely, that of building up the faith of the rising generation on a foundation which cannot be shaken, and leaving the unknown results to God.'

It must be added that it was characteristic of Stanley's whole teaching to sound out a note of Christian hopefulness at a time when the Oxford Movement was fearing and despairing of the country and the Church, and which inspires us still so many years later. For instance, he writes in his *History of the Jewish Church* :

> 'The Future is everything to us, the Past is nothing. The turn, the change, the fixing our faces in the right instead of the wrong direction — this is the difficulty, this is the turning-point, this is the crisis of life. But that once done, the Future is clear before us. The

despondency of the human heart, the timidity or the austerity of churches or sects, may refuse this past Prophetic absolution, may cling to penances and regrets of the Past, may shrink from the glad tidings that the good deeds of the Future can blot out the sorrows and sins of the Past. But the whole Prophetic teaching of the Old and New Testament has staked itself on the issue; it hazards the bold prediction that all will be well when once we have turned; it bids us go courageously forward, in the strength of the Spirit of God, in the power of the life of Christ . . . To that Future of Futures which shall fulfil the yearnings of all that the Prophets have desired on earth. It is for us, wherever we are, to look onwards, upwards, forwards, to the constant expectation of something better than we see or know. Uncertain as to the "day or hour," and as to the manner of fulfilment, this last of all predictions still, like those of old, builds itself upon the Past and Present. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is."'

The early death of Dr. Arnold caused Stanley the greatest distress: 'The greatest calamity that has ever happened to me.' He went to Rugby to help to fix upon the place in the Chapel for the burial. 'It is to be within the rails, immediately before the Communion Table, that being the place usually allotted to the body of the Founder; and as the real Founder is buried elsewhere, I think we may safely predict that there will never arise another who can dispute his claim to it.'

When Arthur Penrhyn Stanley died in 1851, Matthew Arnold wrote of his burial in the Abbey in his poem 'Westminster Abbey,' words which have an appropriate meaning for his Modernist followers to-day.

'And truly he who here
Hath run his bright career,
And served men nobly and acceptance found,
And borne to light and sight his witness high,
What could he better wish than then to die,
And wait the issue, sleeping under ground?
Why should he pray to range
Down the long age of truth that ripens slow;
And break his heart, with all the baffling change,
And all the tedious tossing to and fro?
For this and that way swings
The flux of mortal things,
Though moving inly to one far-set goal—
What had our Arthur gained, to stop and see,
After light's term, a term of cecity,
A Church once large and then grown strait in soul?
To live, and see arise,
Alternating with wisdom's too short reign,
Folly revived, re-furbished sophistries,
And pullulating rites externe and vain?

THE NEED FOR TEACHING*

And every day in the Temple and at home, they ceased not to teach.
THE ACTS v, 42.

ONE of the most significant characteristics of our age is the steady growth of interest in religion. The constantly reiterated claim that the modern world has forsaken God and given itself up to a pagan view of life is not convincing. To maintain and to justify such a sweeping claim is manifestly either to suppress or to overlook some of the most encouraging signs of the times—signs which compel us to recognize that there are few things which make a stronger appeal to thoughtful people in our day than the things of religion.

* * * *

Seldom, if ever, have so many books been published on religious subjects. It is an easy guess that they would not be published in such large numbers if there were not a corresponding demand for them. Publishers are not in business merely to give people what they need, but to make money, and to do this they must give people what they want. And the fact is they want books on religion. Lives of Christ have had an enormous sale. The successful publication and sale by the Student Christian Movement of inexpensive books on all sorts of religious subjects is one of the most astounding achievements in the whole field of literary production. It is significant that the supply of books on religion does not come only from the professional—the parson, or the lay-student of theology. Specialists in other subjects, such as Professors A. N. Whitehead and Eddington have, during recent years, written a number of books which deal in part, if not entirely, with religion. And perhaps the chief value of the books written by the critics of organized and revealed religion, such as those of C. M. Joad and Walter Lippmann, is their demonstration of the appeal which religion has for the modern

*Sermon preached at the Annual Service of the Modern Churchmen's Union, at St. Andrew's Church, Ashley Place, S.W., on May 27th, 1931, by the Reverend Horace Foot, B.A., B.D., Vicar of Holy Trinity Chapel, Brighton.

mind. Wireless preachers testify to the amazing response with which their broadcast sermons and services have been received. In still another direction, we discover evidence of this new interest in religion. The extra-mural facilities for education which have developed during the last half-century have had nothing short of revolutionary results in the social and political life of the country. The University Extension Lectures, the Workers' Educational Association, and the University Tutorial Classes have immeasurably enlarged the influence of the Universities, extended the boundaries of education, and created foundations for a more enlightened and humane public opinion. Until more recently this movement to democratize education has been shy of including religious subjects as a suitable field of study. Economics, history, philosophy, literature, and art, have dominated the choice of subjects. One example alone will suffice to show a change of heart. At a Conference of the British Institute for Adult Education held at Oxford two years ago, there was for the first time a session devoted to Religion and Adult Education. The Conference members were given a choice between this session and one on Drama, and both were held at the same time. To the amazement of everyone the session on Religion and Adult Education proved the greater attraction, and the discussion clearly showed that religion was likely to have a more honourable place in the future of these great movements which hitherto have dealt simply with the secular field of study.

It would be misleading and dangerous to make an exaggerated claim for the foregoing. But I suggest that it gives us reason for believing that there is a very real yearning in the hearts of the men and women of our age for a theory of life which will not only satisfy the deepest needs of human personality, but also make sense of life. In the midst of the babel of conflicting voices clamouring for the allegiance of the people, the voice of religion is being heard—willingly heard. We live in an age the most significant characteristic of which is a new reverence for religion, with its appeal now as much to the mind as to the heart.

The awakened interest in religion, of which I speak, is intellectual. It is governed not by a respect for authority or tradition, as in a former age, but by a desire to understand for one's self the ultimate meaning of things; from a longing for a reason-

able faith. Running through all classes of people, however vague, however inarticulate, there is the belief that there is 'some test of truth beyond tradition, beyond the appeal to emotions, deeper than the prejudices and desires which happen to possess them.' 'There is a willingness to accept the religious view of the world as the best basis for a satisfactory life'—but no longer because the 'professionals' dogmatically assert that it is so. Before acceptance follows there are questions to be asked and answered first, and a frank admission that some questions cannot as yet be answered. The power of critical reflection is now too well established to be swept aside or silenced by an appeal to primitive awe and superstition, or by the claim that all difficulties of belief are moral rather than intellectual. We do serious injustice to this movement of the mind toward an understanding of religion if we treat it with indifference, or smile with superiority at its oftentimes naïve expression, or thank God for it and then do nothing about it. If those who by their vocation are called to teach, continue to neglect their commission, they will have missed the greatest opportunity of their age to win men and women to the Christian thought of God and the Christian way of life. Thoughtful people, seeking knowledge of God, with reverence for Christ and His teaching will continue to remain aloof from organised religion as long as the teaching office of the Church is to be measured in quality and in method by the standard of the average Sunday School or Bible Class. They have a right to expect that the Church should show the same respect for the study of religion as is shown in schools, institutes, colleges and universities for the study of the sciences, and the arts. Can we wonder that thinking people drift from the Church when they discover that religious education is reckoned by the Church to be complete at Confirmation, and further facilities for religious instruction are relegated to the sermon, which at its best is but a feeble method of education. We may well decry the swelling ranks of British Israel, or the Four Square Gospel—English, not American Fundamentalists Movements; we may well lament the appeal to the younger intellectuals of the modern humanist movement, religion without God; but the fault is largely ours, since we have failed, sadly failed, to offer opportunities for the intelligent presentation of the Christian faith to

the adult population of the nation. From fear or from laziness we are evading our primary duty to this generation, *viz.* teaching—with the inevitable result that the cause of religion is weakened by confused thinking, that there is untold loss to the Church and a gradual lowering of the moral quality of life in the community as a whole.

* * * *

But we do not have to look outside the membership of the Church to find the spirit of religious enquiry. The desire for an understanding faith is equally strong and eager amongst the members of the Christian Fellowship. There is need to help it to become articulate: there is need to fire with enthusiasm and confidence those who want to learn but are conscious of their educational and intellectual limitations: there is need to give the lead of encouragement and of opportunity to the thoughtful people in our congregations. If this is done, the response will follow as certainly as the sun will rise in the heavens. Let me underline this point by telling you of one experiment. Picture to yourself one of England's great watering places, renowned for its advantages of health and its opportunities for amusement. It is a place to which elderly people retire to end their days; others, both young and old, bored with their empty lives, go to seek distraction: others to seek rest by changing the nature of their excitement: while in the season thousands of pleasure-seekers and holiday-makers swarm there for their annual respite from work and the cares of home life. By the very nature of things the emphasis in such a place for resident and visitor alike is upon pleasure, excitement, and the light-hearted, care-free side of life. And yet in this place with every imaginable attraction that modern secular civilization can contrive to fill people's leisure moments, there was started last year a School of Religious Study consisting of five tutorial classes for the study of religious subjects. The members of each class realized that they had to meet once a week for twenty-four weeks: that they would be encouraged to read, to discuss, and to write essays. It was a venture of faith. Those who were responsible were prepared for failure. What was the result? One hundred and ninety-two adults enrolled in these five classes: over 150 completed the

course: and there is an insistent request that similar provision for study be made next year. Not satisfied with this, at the end of its session, the School promoted an extra-mural activity in the form of four popular public lectures on God and Modern Thought. The lectures were being given by a Principal of a Theological College, and the hall was packed for each one. After one of the lectures a thoughtful layman remarked, 'I had no idea that there was any theological college in England with a Principal who knew as much about modern science and philosophy as this man does.' And what was the reason for such a remark? Because we have not made opportunity for the layman to come into touch with the learning of our Theological Colleges. We have shown too little respect for the desire of the layman to share with the parish priest and the theological professor the fruits of modern knowledge, both religious and scientific. The example I have given you would be worthy of consideration if it represented the only experiment of its kind in the land. How much more is it worthy of notice when we realize that there are at present two hundred of these tutorial classes in village, hamlet, suburban towns, industrial and non-industrial cities throughout England, and no doubt innumerable other efforts of a different kind no less worthy in places I know not of.

The challenge I wish to leave with you is summed up in the word 'teach.' You affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and conduct. You maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation. Worthy aims indeed! But for whom do you affirm and maintain these high ideals? For your own already enlightened membership. Many of your members are eminent scholars—all of your members are scholarly. Through learned books, through your admirable magazine, through your annual conference and sectional meetings, through reading and study, you are making available to a select few the fruits of modern knowledge in the field of religion.

But I come to you to plead the cause of thousands of intelligent men and women who would claim your ideals as their own, but who, without help, will never understand the erudite book and magazine; who have neither the time nor the money to

attend your conferences. Unless some other step is taken, they will go on longing to learn, longing for help in reaching an understanding faith, unaware that the Church, through organizations such as yours, is in touch with modern thought; and they will come finally to look for guidance from the B.B.C. and snippets on religion in the daily press.

Dr. Matthews has said 'the most effective evangelist of the future will be the teacher.' Where is the Church to find these effective evangelists—these teachers? Is it not fair to suggest that it is an organization like yours which should have this kind of evangelistic spirit? Is it not right to suppose that it is your members who should especially feel the importance of the injunction 'teach.'

I speak to you out of a very real experience, both as former General-Secretary of the Church Tutorial Classes and now as a parish priest, and in the light of that experience I can assure you there is a great task before the clergy and laity of this Union. It is the task of teaching. If you will have patience with people's stupidity and crude ideas; if you will have humility in the face of the limitations of your own knowledge: if you will but believe that there are those who want to learn and who with the necessary encouragement can learn, you will find a field for your influence far greater than you ever realized. You will not only widen the scope of your Union, but what is most important of all, you will help to clear away the vast amount of rubbish which still litters the minds of people to-day—you will help to make ready the way for them to hold a clearer and more intelligent view of God, as revealed in Jesus Christ, and you will help them to a reasonable faith by which alone man can live with power in His Name.

THE CLAIMS OF INTERCOMMUNION*

By the Rev. Canon Guy Rogers, B.D., M.C., Chaplain to the King, Rector of Birmingham.

INTERCOMMUNION is often discussed in too narrow a circle. It is seen only in terms of the neighbour next door. It receives an *ex parte* interpretation and is regarded as the propaganda of a particular school.

As a matter of fact it implies something very like a philosophy of religion and is bound up with the most far-reaching implications.

It is not to be wondered at that it is viewed with suspicion by the ecclesiastical mind and that it arouses in some quarters almost fanatical opposition.

What does it mean? Nothing less than this—that it is a fundamental condition of all Christian living that Christians should live in sacramental fellowship with one another.

If it is fundamental, then no one has a right to take it away from any Christian, and he has a right to challenge the teaching of any church which equates sacramental fellowship with formal correctness of faith or doctrine.

I confess that it is mainly from this point of view that I am interested in the subject of Intercommunion. I see it as a part of the age-long battle to secure the freedom of the spirit in the organization of Church life and part of the modern battle to recover something inherent in the primitive Gospel.

We hear sometimes of people living in sin. It is a phrase usually associated with illicit sexual relationships, but it might well be applied to the lack of sacramental fellowship, formally approved, in which we Christians are living to-day. We are living in sin.

I think it will clarify our thinking and help our discussion if we face the subject in this fundamental way—it will enable us to assess the various attitudes of the Churches to this subject at their proper value.

*Substance of an address given at the Annual Meeting of the Modern Churchmen's Union, May 27th, 1931.

1. The attitude of the Roman Church.

No Pope—no Bishop; no Bishop—no Priest—no Sacrament.

Not much room for Intercommunion there. It is evident that Rome would totally deny my thesis—to Rome sacramental fellowship with all Christians would be a sin. This precious thing called fellowship has been imprisoned in the Roman system and finally slaughtered in the dungeons of the Vatican.

2. The Orthodox Church.

It is very interesting to watch the negotiation going on between the Anglican and Orthodox Churches for Intercommunion. It centres entirely round correctness of form and correctness of doctrine.

These things assume gigantic proportions and may well become alarming to those whose emphasis is on the religion of the Spirit.

Consider the terms on which the Patriarch of Alexandria is prepared to recommend to his brother Patriarchs and their various synods Intercommunion with the Anglican Church:

(1) The Apostolic Succession of the Ministry.
(2) The Eucharist as a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead.

(*Cf.* the exactitude required by comparison between our Primate's letter and the Patriarch's reply printed below.)

There is, I feel, a serious principle at stake in these negotiations. Intercommunion is being equated with doctrine.

My point is not that the doctrine is false or only held by certain sections of our Church, but that this particular catechism and these particular guarantees are regarded as essential before intercommunion can be allowed.

Here again the Sacrament has been violently seized upon and made to serve the purpose of a particular credal statement. It is no longer the symbol of fellowship between all Christians, but the badge of a particular kind of 'orthodoxy.'

3. The Baptist (Strict) Church.

These people do exactly the same. Unless people have been baptized as adults—unless this 'doctrine' is accepted—Communion is refused.

Our own Church.

Of course our attitude in this, as in other matters, is peculiarly Anglican.

We do not say: 'No bishop—no priest; no priest—no Sacrament.'

We do not say there must be uniformity of doctrine. It is well known that the Apostolic succession is not of 'faith' in the Church of England, and our own history records many instances of intercommunion between members of our own Church and other Churches without episcopal orders.

(See Archdeacon Hunkin's book, *Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation in relation to Intercommunion and Reunion.*)

We do not say that the Confirmation Rubric necessarily forbids people of non-episcopal Churches coming to an Anglican celebration.

The history of the rubric, originally taken from a Provincial Constitution of Archbishop Peckham of the thirteenth century, is well known.

With recognized variety of teaching in the Church of England about the Episcopacy, the relation of Confirmation to Baptism, what constitutes a valid Sacrament and other similar kindred subjects, it is natural that the Church of England should avoid clear-cut issues which are entirely welcome both to the Church of Rome and the Orthodox Church.

The official attitude is to hesitate to condemn the constitution and practice of other Churches, but rigidly to abstain from encouraging any policy which might assume the spiritual equality of episcopal and non-episcopal Churches.

How long an attitude like that can really last is very doubtful. To refuse intercommunion on the ground that all must adhere for salvation to the Pope of Rome, or that uniformity of doctrine according to the General Councils of the Undivided Church must first be accepted, is both intelligible and logical.

But to refuse it on the ground of convenience, or of suitability, or of local custom, is to refuse it on a ground which is open to continual challenge.

What right has ecclesiastical 'convention' to forbid permanently the assertion of the great principle of which I have spoken

—that sacramental fellowship is fundamental to a Christian life?

When that principle is really understood and accepted it will arouse such enthusiasm that no non-committal attitude can possibly stand before it.

We have, however, been carried far beyond this non-committal attitude by the leaders of our Church who took part in the Lausanne Conference.

We have, in fact, reached an attitude of sheer negation. Intercommunion as a policy is postponed until questions of Order and of Doctrine have been settled.

This right of sacramental fellowship, primitive in origin, recently newly apprehended in this century, is to be dismissed from the purview of this generation, except where agreement on Orders and Doctrines has been reached. It is to be reserved, if we are to follow the majority at Lausanne, as a coping-stone for the ecclesiastical edifice which is being rebuilt.

It does not take much perception to see that inter-communion would then become merely a phase of a final synthesis.

Intercommunion, as we understand the term, is something very different. It implies the recognition of the right of other Churches, whether they have Episcopal Orders or not, to exist at present and to negotiate with us on equal terms. It implies a spiritual privilege which we believe we ought to be at liberty to enjoy at the present time.

Here I should like to quote the Bishop of Durham—from a lecture he gave in 1909 on Reunion and Intercommunion. He recognizes Intercommunion as the true preliminary to any useful discussion of corporate union. Here are his words:

> 'Intercommunion is the necessary expression of full recognition, and therefore is the true preliminary to any useful discussion of corporate union. When the Churches have entered into the religious covenant of Christian discipleship, of which the common reception of the Holy Communion is the appointed symbol, then they can discuss without suspicion or humiliation the further question, whether they should or should not merge their separate organisations.'

The Lausanne theory that intercommunion must depend upon the solution of the problems of Doctrine and Orders has been most ably answered by Dr. Adams Brown, who was a conspicuous member of the Conference at Lausanne. In an essay in 'The

Reunion of Christendom,' edited by James Marchant, he shows the inconsistency of the position as compared with the way in which the Conference dealt with the question of the Creeds.

Although the Conference could not arrive at an agreement about their respective attitudes to the historic Creeds, they did not hesitate to formulate a Christian message on which they could all agree. In spite of their differences, they did not hesitate to give expression to the essential unity of their faith.

Why then, he argues, should not the Conference, in spite of its differences on questions of Orders, give expression to its unity in sacramental worship?

The whole passage is so important that I will cite it in full:

> 'It was assumed at Lausanne, by no less representative a speaker than the present Archbishop of York, that because intercommunion in the full sense is the goal of the Reunion movement, it cannot be at the same time in certain specific instances a means to that goal. But this is by no means clear.
>
> 'The attitude taken by the Conference to the parallel matter of Faith furnishes an illuminating commentary. Had the Faith of the Church been treated in the same manner as was followed in the case of the Sacrament, the remarkable unity reached in the statement on the Christian Message would have been impossible.
>
> 'In this case it was assumed that the Faith of the Church is antecedent to and independent of the Creeds, and a way was found to bring this unity to expression without waiting for the time when the Church as a whole should have adopted a uniform procedure with reference to the Creed.
>
> 'But the worship of the Church is not less important than its Faith, and this worship, all agree, culminates in the Sacrament.
>
> 'Surely it must be equally possible to bring that existing unity to expression in action without waiting for the time when all questions of Order have been satisfactorily adjusted.
>
> 'If, as the great majority of those who were present were prepared to admit, the Lord's Supper, in spite of the differing methods of administration, is a genuine means of grace to those who participate, it must be possible for those who believe this, at stated times and under proper safeguards, to commune together.'

I cannot restrain a feeling of disappointment as I think of Lausanne, for on its pronouncements lies the shadow of the necessity of formal correctness.

There is quite inadequate recognition of the movement of the Spirit towards freeing sacramental fellowship from the ecclesiastical barriers which have grown up round it. It is made dependent upon something with which it originally had no concern.

I find it difficult to recognize the Archbishop of York's leadership, in accepting the many restrictions which are insisted upon, when I recall his words spoken in November, 1927, when Bishop of Manchester, and speaking at the Manchester Diocesan Conference:

> 'I must go further than that. I am very anxious on this occasion, whilst making it plain that the opinion is my own, to convey it to you as my personal opinion for you to consider.
>
> '*If we really think about it,* we must, I believe, come to the conclusion that not only a Free Church Minister but any layman who should, devoutly and not defiantly, decide that it is right for him to celebrate the Holy Communion would effect a real consecration, and through it the real gift would be given.
>
> 'For I believe that the limitation of the celebration to the Priesthood, which is of the highest value for maintaining the full meaning of the service and keeping it alive before the minds of men, so that they expect the fullness of God's gift and, as they expect, receive it, is none the less a rule of discipline.
>
> '*There is nothing, so to speak, in the nature of things which makes it impossible for any but Priests to celebrate and administer a real sacrament.*
>
> 'At the same time, the circumstances which could make it right for a layman of our Church to violate so fundamental a rule of discipline are so rare as to be negligible. Why the rule of discipline is so important I have already tried to show. This, therefore, is not a matter of great practical importance, but it affects the principle, and I want to put my whole mind before you.'

Surely this sacrament, which in its essence is so independent of any particular form of ordination or of ministration, might be more at the corporate disposal of all Christians.

I TURN NOW TO OUR OWN ATTITUDE.

In these disappointing circumstances, what is our own attitude to be?

First of all, I would suggest that we should explore to the uttermost the great principle which I have enunciated — that sacramental fellowship is fundamental to the Christian life, and that we should make it a part of our own mental and spiritual outlook.

I suggest then, in no narrow or sectarian way, we ought never to refuse the opportunity of sacramental fellowship wherever it naturally presents itself.

Of course we ought to have intercommunion with the Greek Orthodox Church, but we ought not to be asked to pay the price of twisting or adjusting our own doctrine for the purpose.

I should be in favour of offering it whole-heartedly, just as things stand.

To stand apart from any Christian at the Lord's Table is to be living in sin.

In the same way I would go to Holy Communion with a Roman Catholic, without hesitation, if he would accept me, and would gladly welcome him at the Lord's Table in my own church. To do otherwise would be living in sin.

In the same way all these minor questions as to whether we should receive the Communion from someone who wears vestments, or makes use of some unfamiliar ritual, are quite beside the point.

Christians have a perfect right to continue their controversies, and I think there is real conflict going on at the present time for the soul of the Church of England, but that has no right to prevent us going to the common Lord and finding fellowship in realms where such controversies no longer exist.

II. *Again, I would urge that in our teaching and in our practice we should make the most of the Lambeth Resolution* 42, which really in its implication traverses the negative attitude of Lausanne :

> 'The Bishop of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any Bishop who may, in his discretion so exercised, sanction an exception to the general rule in special areas, where the ministrations of an Anglican Church are not available for long periods of time or without travelling great distances, or may give permission that baptised communicant members of Churches not in communion with our own should be encouraged to communicate in Anglican churches, when the ministrations of their own Church are not available, or in other special or temporary circumstances.'

Here there is a real point gained. The long struggle for more elasticity in our outlook on questions of order and sacraments is slowly bearing fruit. Presbyterians in English villages, Anglicans in the glens of Scotland, Methodists on holiday on the Continent, Lutherans arriving in this country will presently be able to avail themselves without let or hindrance of the Sacraments of the nearest Church.

III. *Again, I would urge that we should keep the psychological aspect of the subject well to the front.* I believe myself

fervently that it is by sacramental expression of the fellowship wherever it exists that we are really going to achieve the only kind of union that is worth having.

Negotiations may succeed in restoring formal correctness to the Church, and all the barriers of Intercommunion may be removed by diplomacy, and in the end Intercommunion might be a spiritual failure. It can only usefully come into operation as an expression of a fellowship and spirit already enjoyed.

Wherever that fellowship exists it can be deepened and increased by sacramental acts, as married love may be deepened by the acts of married life.

Here is a testimony from a well-known missionary in Japan :

> 'I was much struck the other day by a little incident in which I played a part. One of the leading Methodist missionaries out here came up to me after a group of C.M.S. men had deliberately attended a united Communion taken by a Methodist Bishop at the close of our Annual Conference of Federated Missions and said :
>
> '"To see your men there made me want to go straight away to receive ordination at the hands of one of your bishops that we might become one."
>
> 'He would never have said that if we had presented to him the most clear and cogent argument for the need of episcopal ordination.'

IV. As regards the question of opportunities for Intercommunion, there is an exceedingly interesting essay on Intercommunion by the Bishop of Ripon in a volume, *Towards Reunion*, published in 1919. He there suggests opportunities :

1. The offer of 'spiritual hospitality.'
2. Occasions when great national joy or sorrow makes men forget their differences of party or class.
3. When groups of representative men and women are meeting to discuss the problem of unity.

That was in 1919. I think as a matter of fact we have got further than that now. I believe there are neighbouring congregations which are ready for this expression of fellowship.

There are also groups of people who cannot exactly be called representative who are desirous of it.

I believe the field is continually widening. It is a person with spiritual vision who will see where the next step may be wisely taken and the next part of the field courageously occupied.

Let me conclude with President Wilson's words, at the Commemoration of Mr. Vernon, about Washington and his friends:

> 'They looked out upon the world and saw it whole. Saw it with the light of the future upon it. Saw it with modern eyes that turned away from a past which men of liberated spirit could no longer endure.'

NOTE.—Resolution of the Synod of Alexandria, conveyed in a letter of the Patriarch Meletios II to the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the translator's official notes.

'The Holy Synod recognises that the declarations of the Orthodox, quoted in the *Summary*, were made according to the spirit of Orthodox teaching.

'Inasmuch as the Lambeth Conference approved the declarations of the Anglican Bishops as a genuine account[1] of the teaching and practice of the Church of England and the Churches in communion with it, it welcomed them as a notable step towards the Union of the two Churches.

'And since in these declarations, which were endorsed by the Lambeth Conference, complete and satisfying assurances is found as to the Apostolic Succession, as to a real reception of the Lord's Body and Blood, as to the Eucharist being a *thusia hilasterios*,[2] and as to Ordination being a *mysterion*, the Church of Alexandria withdraws its precautionary negative to the acceptance of the validity of Anglican Ordinations, and, adhering to the decision of the Œcumenical Patriarchate of July 28th, 1922, pronounces that if priests, ordained by Anglican Bishops, accede to Orthodoxy, they should not be re-ordained, as persons baptized by Anglicans are not re-baptized.'

[1] The words in the Resolution of the Lambeth Conference are 'sufficient account.'

[2] We transliterate the term *thusia hilasterios*, and do not translate it by *propitiatory sacrifice* or *expiatory sacrifice*, because, as generally used, those terms present conceptions which are not attached by the orthodox to *thusia hilasterios*.

The words used by the Anglican Bishops in their discussions with the Orthodox Delegation, as recorded in the *résumé* and endorsed by the Lambeth Conference, are:

'. . . that the Anglican Church teaches the doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice as explained in *The Answer of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to Pope Leo XIII on Anglican Ordination*, and also that in the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the Anglican Church prays that "by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion," as including the whole company of faithful people, living and departed.' (*Lambeth Conference Report*, 1930, p. 139.)

THE LITERARY REMAINS OF BARON VON HÜGEL*

By Professor Percy Gardner, Litt.D., F.B.A.

WE must begin our notice of this valuable work with a word of tribute to the Editor, von Hügel's literary executor. He had to deal with a mass of unpublished papers in every state of preparedness; some almost ready for press, some mere notes and jottings. Everything that the author wrote must have had some value, and it must have required great courage, as well as keen literary judgment, to determine what was to be printed, and what, in deference to the reputation of the author, must be set aside. Professor Edmund Gardner found that two sets of papers came into the first of these classes. In the first place, there were certain portions of the Gifford Lectures, carefully prepared and planned, but never delivered, which seemed in a not unfit state for publication. Of course they are but a fragment; but certainly every admirer of von Hügel—and they are numerous in all Christian bodies—will be very glad to have them. The second work, left uncompleted, is a study of the works of Sir Alfred Comyn Lyall, one of the greatest and most sympathetic authorities on Indian and Oriental religions. This was begun in 1912 but laid aside and never completed. The Editor remarks that it had been revised by the author himself, and represents him at the height of his powers and mental activity.

As to the second treatise, the discussion of the views of Sir A. C. Lyall, I have no space to say anything. The drawback inherent in it is that it is largely concerned, not only with Lyall's writings, but with conversations which he held with the author, and, strictly speaking, thus offers great difficulties. The misfortune is that Lyall is no longer living, and cannot make any reply, or point out any misinterpretations, if such there be.

It is, I think, certain that if we had, in complete form, von Hügel's argument for the Reality of God, it would have been invaluable. He observes that none of the published Gifford

* The literary remains of Baron Friedrich von Hügel. Edited by Edmund G. Gardner. (Dent, 1931. Price 15/-.)

Lectures, except Professor Laurie's *Synthetica*, deal with the subject. And its treatment, by one who combines very wide reading with an extremely thoughtful and synthetic mind, and a remarkable keenness of religious feeling, could not but have given us much for which we might look in vain elsewhere. In his well-balanced mind the intellectual, the ethical, and the practical elements in religion were all taken fully into account. And the reader who could look beyond the difficulty of the style, the involution of the sentences, and the tendency to abstract statements, would have found a rich harvest. Von Hügel's mind moved on German lines, and he evidently thought in German, and scarcely makes allowance for the more concrete and pedestrian English intelligence. But those who not merely read, but in his own phrase browse on, his works will find depths and heights, long vistas and profound thoughts, such as are found in few of his contemporaries.

But it is clear that when one has to do, not with a fully-reasoned treatise, but with sections disconnected and not finally revised, it is necessary to consider them separately and mainly in the light which they throw on the author's complicated and cavernous mind. Indeed, the Editor suggests such a course. And the author so frequently not merely states his views, but explains how he came by them, that there is a large element of autobiography in the book. I may therefore be excused if in reviewing a fragmentary book I write a fragmentary notice.

When, in one of my papers, I spoke of Lord Balfour as an agnostic, he was indignant. 'I am not an agnostic,' he wrote, 'but a Christian.' On the other hand, Dr. Edwin Abbott called himself a Christian agnostic. It is evident that the word agnostic, invented by Huxley to explain his own position, needs analysis and definition. Speculative or philosophic agnosticism is very different from ethical or practical agnosticism. Many interesting treatises have been in recent times written in confutation of religious agnosticism; and everything depends upon the premisses from which the treatise starts and the object set before the writer.

Von Hügel's own position, in his attack on agnosticism, is a very complicated one. On the one hand, he is singularly open to the claims of modern science, whether physical or human

science. He fully appreciates the tendencies prevalent in the modern treatment of history and psychology. And he has a strong vein of personal religion; a deep sense of the presence and the love of God. But, on the other hand, he is devoted to the Roman Church, which accepts in these matters the supremacy of the Roman Curia; and will not tolerate any views, not only in religion but in history, which are condemned by it. Hence great difficulty. His learned and subtle mind is always searching for ways in which the two tendencies may be reconciled. And his remarkable power of sympathy and his wide charity make him far more ready to find truth and goodness in all the embodiments of the spirit of religion than to point out their lapses and weaknesses. He carries out the principle of Frederick Denison Maurice, that the various schools of Christian thought are much more likely to be right when they affirm than when they deny. He has also, like the rest of us, some prejudices which are deeply engrained, such as his dislike of the Puritans, and in particular of that magnificent Puritan, Milton. It is no wonder that the course of his argument is often hard to follow.

In the Introduction, von Hügel lays down three principles as dominant in his criticism of religion. In the first place, it is analytical and not genetic, more concerned with the actual facts of the religious life than with the history of their origins. This is no doubt a wise warning, for there is at present a tendency, especially among scientifically trained men, to think that when we have searched out the historic origins of religious awe, of worship, of sacrifice, and the other great facts of religion, we have accounted for them, and need not trouble about them any more. This is a natural result of the triumph of Darwinism. Von Hügel observes that 'there is no making our knowledge of beginnings as certain in its details as can be our knowledge of what we actually now hold in our hands and what surrounds us on all sides.' And the present facts are of infinitely more importance than our discoveries as to the past.

In the second place, the author insists that our starting-point must be the realm of facts, however bewildering and complicated they may be, rather than any theory however seductive.

In the third place, he dwells on the strange but certain 'interaction of any one thing with any other.' A fourth principle

adopted is a true and ever-present reverence for the body. The secret of the recent dominance of the Hegelian philosophy he attributes to its persistent opposition to materialism: but he holds that it does in fact lead to Pantheism.

Reverence for the body is very notable in von Hügel's work, especially when he comes to speak of institutional religion. But I am not sure that he reaches the bottom of the very difficult subject of its survival of death. Does he believe, as did St. Paul, and as the Spiritists do now, in a spiritual body, in many ways similar to that we have now? This view labours under enormous difficulties: and it is to be observed that St. Paul cuts these difficulties—'God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him.' The Spiritists have very definite notions as to the spiritual or ethereal body; but few people beyond their circle take those notions seriously. At page 132 von Hügel speaks of the body as a necessary condition of all emotion, and finds a difficulty in the fact that we know God to be without a body, yet we believe in 'His life as primarily a life of richest and most harmonious emotion.' I fear we here reach a region where the feet of investigation cannot penetrate, and the wings of imagination flap idly. Von Hügel escapes from it by saying, 'We shall then attempt to follow Plato's advice, and seek and pursue the beautiful, the true, and the good, with all we are.' This is the true pragmatism; and the author is quite right in objecting to the false pragmatism which he regards as only a practical shift for reaching some working arrangement which may be ultimately false.

It is impossible here to summarize or even to sketch the course of the subtle arguments for the reality of God which the author derives from considerations of experience over a very wide field, ranging from daily perceptions to abstract thought, from mathematics and physiology to ethics, from the natural views of the ordinary man to the delicate gossamers of the Schoolmen. Nominalists and Realists, Platonists and Aristotelians, Kant and Hegel, Eucken and Tröltsch, and recent English philosophers are all passed in review. The author seems to have read everything, and to have found some good in everything he has read. As in reading Greek tragedies we are often more appreciative of passages in the choruses than of the definite purposes of the poet, so in reading von Hügel we are often

more struck by some of the *obiter dicta* than by the serious argument. They are the overflow of a godly wisdom. He does not read in order to refute, but in order to acquire. I may transcribe a few passages.

> 'Whilst a one-sidedness of the ethical kind in a soul possessed of little or no specifically religious sense can still produce something noble in its own kind; and whilst, again, a life devoted to the search after the truth and reality of things, even when these things are limited to the structure of a plant or the movement of a star, can achieve a mind and character full of dignity; a similar predominance of the aesthetic sense over these other senses will not produce a correspondingly deep and dignified personality' (p. 95).
>
> 'The scale of worth, truth and beauty cannot possibly be a result primarily, and in the first instance, of the struggle for existence. On the contrary, each step in complication, richness and delicacy of response to new claims and necessities is in defiance of any law of material survival in the rough and tumble of actual existence' (p. 54).
>
> 'Every healthy and at all complete human being possesses a ready love and finds a prompt rest and refreshment in external nature. . . . And these delights spring primarily from the need of, and the hunger for, Reality, Presence, Existence, something to lean upon, to lean because it resists, because it is not our own mind, nor this our mind's projection, but because our mind can, and does, apprehend it as rational' (p. 73).
>
> 'I do not see, I have never seen why any man should be called on to answer everything, or why a position may not be profoundly true, though it involves at once difficulties beyond solution by the wit of man' (p. 124).

I might quote a multitude of other *dicta*, but refrain. I will only cite one more passage, which seems to me to contain a curious lapse. Von Hügel cites the beauty of plants as not meant in the first instance to please men, but to attract the male or female of the species. He overlooks the function of the bee, the go-between without which fertilization in plants would not ordinarily take place. The beauty of a flower may attract the bee, but hardly the male or female plant.

We turn naturally to the chapter headed *Need of Institutional Religion*, as it deals with a subject on which von Hügel was very strong, and as to which he differed from many of the like-minded. Unfortunately it is very short—fourteen pages—and no doubt many of the points in it were amplified in the manuscript not printed. It also seems to me more obscure than other chapters. The author expresses his views as follows. He begins by observing that 'Religion derives all its chief power and passion from tradition and institution.' I will not quote, but condense, his argument.

It is really in opposition to the abstract man-made constructions of the last century, which are devoid of religious passion. The chief drawback to it comes from the necessity of using institutional experts and officials; but here is a risk which must be run. The simplest and deepest of all the reasons for institutional religion lies in the fact that so long as we have a body we can only have experience of God through the senses of the audible and visible. St. John of the Cross, though, as a mystic, convinced that only what is purely spiritual can be the means of union with God, yet is not independent of Church ordinance and practice. The same may be said of Luther, and this connection of religion with the concrete and temporal brings to our spiritual apprehension ease and rest, something of the *givenness* and repose of our apprehension of the outside world. It is in the historical and institutional religions that the sense of the more than humanness of God has flourished. It is easy to find fault with inquisitors and superstition-mongers; but, after all, religion is a social thing, and no man lives to himself.

The vivid sense of religion is almost sure to make a man regard his own Church as all-true, and other bodies as all-false. 'How can I live and die for what I admit is but one of many sincere rivals?' It is part of the strength of Christianity that at its basis lies the Jewish faith. Theologians insist that, unlike human sciences, Theology does not grow but persists. But in the Old Testament we have the polygamy of the patriarchs and the disbelief in the future life of some Psalms. The sacramental part of Christianity is the richest part of what is all rich. But it is another thing to maintain that Baptism and the Eucharist are literally and exclusively the vehicles of divine grace. This is denied by Augustine, and even in the Gospels. The eminently orthodox Cardinal de Lugo held it to be of faith that every soul born into the world with normal faculties is furnished by God with grace sufficient to escape perdition. The truly Catholic mind delights in finding the operation and faithfulness of the *Institution,* and does not regard the matter in a purely individualist way. This leaves space for the Hindu temple and the Buddhist monastery. The claim of Christianity to universality need not produce intolerance, but the denial of it makes religion shrink into a sacristy. The conviction that there is one God, and innumerable sides of life, every one of which, so far as it is good, springs from him and requires him, is the true Cathoilcism.

On this statement I would only make the somewhat obvious criticism that such Catholicism would be acceptable to most liberals. It would satisfy, not only the great Churches of Christendom, but the Presbyterian, the Lutheran, and the Baptist. Even more, it could be welcomed by the Buddhist and the Mohammedan of the more liberal schools. Von Hügel would no doubt accept the principle of St. Peter in *Acts*, 'In every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him.' But it seems to me that he lays far more stress on the first clause of the text, the fear of God, than on the second, the works of righteousness.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE VISION OF GOD*

Dr. Kirk's long-awaited Bampton Lectures, delivered in 1928, have now appeared, in a volume which more than justifies the delay, and which must at once take its place as a permanent contribution to our knowledge of the history alike of Christian institutions and of Christian ethics. How Dr. Kirk has found time, amid the distractions of a busy life, to bring together so large a range of material, and to annotate it with such meticulous accuracy and detail, must remain a mystery even to his friends. It is with a certain *naïveté* that he remarks that he has 'restored to the text passages which considerations of time made it impossible to deliver from the University pulpit: some further passages have been added, together with the appended notes dealing with points of detail.' Actually the book is fully four times as long as the spoken lectures, since, *crede experto,* these cannot possibly extend to much more than sixty thousand words. And those who heard, and delighted in, the lectures will be the first to admit that the enrichment has been abundantly worth while.

The book is a fitting sequel, upon the historical side, to the series of studies which have placed Dr. Kirk in the forefront of English scholars in the field of Christian Ethics. Its general purpose is to determine the nature of that *Summum bonum* upon which the ethical systems of Christianity depend, and to trace the striking and heroic history of the attempts which successive generations of the saints have made to embody it in a way of life. For without a conception of the *Summum bonum* there can be no formal ethics, whether Christian or pagan, and the problems of hedonism, altruism, asceticism, and the rest, can only be determined in its light. But for the Christian, and, indeed, far beyond the borders of Christianity, this fundamental goal or ideal of human life has been most typically conceived as the vision of God, and it is thus that Dr. Kirk derives the title and the theme of his lectures. As he points out, the text 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God' provides the key-stone of Christian ethics, by linking the ethical problem of purity with its fundamental principle in the vision of God. At the same time it provided the Church with the gravest of practical problems, since the quest for purity and the interpretation of the Divine vision have proved equally difficult.

But the book might almost equally well be called a study and vindication of worship. For the whole purport of its argument is to show that no codification of conduct, no 'moralism, or formalism,' can produce that unselfishness and disinterestedness in which true purity of heart consists. 'Christianity,' says Dr. Kirk, 'has known for centuries what psychology has discovered in recent years—that the introvert is of all others the type of character most remote from the ethical ideal.' But this leaves us with worship as the one way in which the soul can escape from itself, since 'worship depends not upon our own activities, but upon the activities which God brings to bear upon us; to them we are forced to react as worshippers.' And thus:

> 'When once it is recognised that worship is the key to disinterestedness, the effort to conform to codes and standards of behaviour

* *The Vision of God, the Christian Doctrine of the Summum Bonum.* By the Rev. K. E. Kirk, D.D. (Longmans. 25/- net.)

> falls into its proper place. It is, on the one hand, an activity which the worshipping soul finds itself compelled to undertake so that its worship may flow more freely; on the other, an invariable outcome of all true worship, in so far as the latter inevitably strives to render its environment more harmonious with the Ideal of which it has caught glimpses. Self-discipline and service, therefore, are to be thought of both as the antecedents and the consequents of worship; and so long as they retain these subordinate but wholly necessary positions, the disinterestedness of worship overflows upon them, and (in M. Bremond's fine phrase) "disinfects them from egoism."'

In the opening pages of his book Dr. Kirk relates the fundamental concept of the vision of God, from which he starts, to the problem of discipline, and it is in the light of that special problem that his whole historical enquiry is developed. It is no criticism of his work that he again and again makes us wish that he had wandered further down some promising cross-road, to which he has himself brought us. In at least three fields a whole volume of interesting material might have been brought under survey. Almost all the historical features of the story here told can be paralleled in Eastern religions, with their mystic vision, their asceticism, their monasticism. Again, the material here collected would amply repay a much fuller philosophical and ethical treatment than the scope of these lectures admitted. And, thirdly, it cries out for an adequate psychological analysis at every point. To ask for these things within the limits of this present volume would be absurd, but it is perhaps not unfair to hope that Dr. Kirk, or others, may be inspired to add to our thankfulness 'for what we have received.'

Only a very brief survey of the contents of the book can be attempted, a survey which can do nothing to indicate the immense range of facts upon which the argument depends, and the imposing wealth of the references to the relevant literature in the footnotes.

The problem of discipline comes first, and is shown to take three main forms, Institutionalism, Formalism and Rigorism. Of these the first, institutionalism, is dealt with briefly enough, since it is only the general aspect imposed upon discipline by its corporate character. Its history is in fact only important for Dr. Kirk's purpose in so far as it has expressed itself in systems of life not merely imposed upon the individual by the Church, but accepted by the individual for himself. Is the vision of God to be sought by any code of rules? To assert that it is seems to be falling back upon that Law from which Paul bids us be free. And yet it seems impossible to suppose 'that the ideal of ordered self-discipline has *no* place in the Christian life.' This is the problem of formalism. Beyond this lies a further question. Granted the need for discipline, is it to be rigorist or humanist in character? Rigorism 'tends to test the worth of every action by its cost to the giver, and the degree to which it requires him to mortify his own affections and to enforce a caveat against his natural instincts, rather than by its value to the receiver.' Humanism, a term which Dr. Kirk uses in a sense suggested by M. Brémond, 'finds goodness in embracing the world and its joys, not in flight from them; it looks for God in His creation, instead of seeking Him by spurning what He has made.'

These three themes run throughout the book, but it may be noted that it is in this final problem, that of the interplay of rigorism and humanism, that Dr. Kirk is chiefly interested. Institutionalism, as such, practically falls out of view, though much that is relevant to it is said in connection with the development of monasticism and with the attitude both of the

Roman and of the later Protestant traditions to ascetic discipline. Formalism, as the central issue of the sub-apostolic period, receives a full chapter to itself. But from the fourth lecture on, the problem of rigorism occupies the foreground. By the middle of the second century the Gnostics, and Marcion in particular, had made the issue a fundamental one for the Christian life. And the New Testament at least lent colour to the rigorist view. Dr. Kirk endorses the view of Weiss and Schweitzer that 'the ascetic outlook of the Gospels is seen to stand out of any recognisable relation with contemporary Judaism.' The Rabbis were unquestionably 'humanist,' in M. Brémond's sense, whereas 'among the most characteristic sayings of Jesus are some at least which demand uncompromising renunciation of this life and its blessings.' Yet 'His teaching has another side. An array of texts could be quoted which endorse the legitimacy of earthly joys and ideals, and proclaim or imply the permanent value of natural beauty, domestic happiness, and civil order.'

Dr. Kirk is happy in his illustration of the difficulties with which the early Christians thus found themselves faced from the actual variations in the transmission of the text of the New Testament itself. And he has interesting treatments of such difficult problems as these concerned with the 'curse' set by St. Paul upon the offender at Corinth, the 'sin unto death,' and the 'sin against the Holy Ghost.' As to the 'curse' Dr. Kirk rejects the ordinary view that the sinner was just excommunicated and so placed outside the protecting pale of the Church and rendered liable to death. But is this not really easier than that which he adopts. As yet death was rare within the Christian community, and, when it occurred, was regarded as unnatural. St. Paul himself seems to have regarded it as due to the dishonouring of the Lord's Body in the Eucharist. Both he and the offender may well have thought ominously enough of the demoniac perils that lurked outside the protecting pale of Christianity. Again, Dr. Kirk has an interesting and illuminating discussion of the teaching of our Lord about reward. But is it not too complex a solution to suggest that His conscious intention was 'to forbid the conscious quest for disinterestedness.' Clearly He could not have commended any 'official road to altruism,' but should we not simply see in His words the encouraging of that rejoicing and child-like spirit which enters gladly and thankfully into the joy of its Lord. Such gladness is not self-seeking, but the happiness natural to the sons of the kingdom.

But it is when Dr. Kirk reaches the strange stories of the early hermits and of monasticism that most readers will find his argument most engrossing, partly because the issues become simpler and the evidence more complete, and partly because he has ransacked the available sources, some of them not very generally accessible, for apt and often amusing illustration. No contrast in history is more striking than that between the broad humanity of St. Augustine and the intolerable savagery of St. Jerome, scared into vituperation by the Vanity Fair of his day. The story of the first hermits and coenobites, and of the monasticism which from its beginnings tempered their extravagance with a truly humanist outlook, is told with a delightful sympathy and sureness of touch. And readers not familiar with the detail of the story will probably be suprised to realise to how great an extent the monasticism of St. Basil, St. Benedict, and St. Bernard, like the great ethical system of St. Thomas himself, saved the Church from rigorism and opened the door to a humanist interpretation of the Gospel for which we, with our modern liberty, have not always been sufficiently thankful.

When Dr. Kirk comes to sum up the evidence provided by this part of his story he shows a judgment as well-balanced as it is well-informed. Thus, of the mystical experience:

> 'If we once grant that personal experience of God is possible, we shall not be disposed to deny that some at least of those who claim to have 'seen' or 'known' or 'held communion' with God have really done so—least of all if they make that claim with due humility and reticence, and manifest the fruits of their experience in lives of self-forgetful service. Nor can it be denied that all such experience of God is in some sense ecstatic—that is to say, that at such times the mind is wholly concentrated upon Him who is present to it, and thereby relegates all thoughts of self into the background. This does not mean, of course, that every "ecstatic" experience is an experience of God; there are ecstasies of evil as well as of good. Nor does it imply that "ecstatic conditions" in the narrower sense—visions, automatisms, loss of consciousness and the like—are *even at best* anything more than occasional and irrelevant concomitants of this experience of God. We can reject without hesitation any suggestion that communion with God is only possible when phenomena of this kind are experienced.'

And again, in claiming the occasional 'exaltations' of ordinary worship as one with the hermit's 'contemplation' and the mystic's 'way of union':

> 'Not that an act of worship is vain and useless if it fails to bring the consummation of self-forgetfulness. Contemplation, as a human activity, is not so much "looking *at* God" as "looking *towards* God." If the Christian in worship, public or private, looks toward God with all the strength he possesses, he has done his part, and may rest assured that in some way or another—though not necessarily through any type of experience with which the words of others have made him familiar—God will respond to his advances. To expect a response of one *particular* kind is to doubt the resources of God; to expect a reponse of an emotional kind is, once again, to be looking at oneself and not at God. And neither of these attitudes has any place in Christian prayer.'

The later developments of the long struggle are equally interesting, if a trifle less bizarre. Dr. Kirk takes five great names as indicating its critical moments, names of Saints who, each in his own way, helped forward the task of harnessing the enthusiasm of ascetic and mystic so that it might bear fruit in the service of the Church. But this emphasis upon St. Augustine, St. Bernard, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Ignatius of Loyola, and St. Francis de Sales, does not break the continuity either of the history or of the argument. The treatment of the purpose and the actual historical effects of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius is of peculiar interest and importance, and the whole of this part of Dr. Kirk's argument is of the very greatest significance for those who see in the modern retreat movement one of the most powerful vitalising forces in the Church of England to-day. His discussion suggests the need for a flexibility in the application of methods of meditation, and of spiritual guidance, which has sometimes been sadly lacking. At the same time it illustrates the immense need, especially in these modern days of liberty, for ordered self-discipline alike in prayer and in service.

Thus we are brought back once more to the central thesis of the book. 'A system of thought which is primarily moralistic,' in so far as it sets before men a rule of conduct by which it is their first duty to measure

themselves, is in essence egocentric. In this connection Dr. Kirk has some most pertinent criticisms to make of that 'prophetic' religion which Heiler finds in Luther, and seems himself to endorse. That the object of this 'prophetic' prayer should be 'man's own joy and sorrow, his troubles and fears, his plans and confidences' (*Das Gebet*, p. 359) is in the end disastrous, for it must needs mean the loss of the vision of God. Dr. Kirk has valuable comments to make upon the relation of service and contemplation as ideals. The two are not and cannot be opposed in the truest religous life. Least of all is it true that we worship in order that we may serve better. Certainly 'the danger of "service," as an ideal, is that it fosters the spirit of patronage: the glory of worship is to elicit the grace of humility.' But the saints see further. 'Service here on earth is no more than a preparation for the contemplation of heaven, and in heaven contemplation is the only service required of the redeemed. In earthly worship man does not merely secure for service that which alone can make it serviceable; he anticipates the essential and all-engrossing activity of eternal life.'

The final section of the history is brought in under the heading of 'Disinterestedness and Pure Love,' and, though the order is logical and perhaps inevitable, the detailed study of the controversy between Bossuet and Fénelon comes so near the end of the argument as to be a little confusing. Nevertheless it is illuminating in more ways than one. The story is a terrible revelation of the dangers of institutionalism when the institution has become its own end, and dangerous though Madame Guyon undoubtedly was—and modern psychological analysis confirms the uneasy suspicion of the ecclesiastics of her day—no defence is possible of the manner of the condemnation which overtook both herself and her champion. And Fénelon himself has been abundantly vindicated, as Dr. Kirk puts it, 'at the bar of Christian thought.' 'To say,' as his opponents said, 'that unselfishness is impossible, and therefore cannot be made a test of behaviour, Christian or otherwise, is to deny the crucial principle of the gospel ethics.' And thus once more we are driven back upon worship, as the one means whereby self-centredness can be purged away from the soul.

Dr. Kirk's final pages are too compressed to admit of summary. He takes up once more and states in broad outline an answer to the problems of institutionalism, formalism, and rigorism, from which he started. It must suffice here to quote one final passage in which he sums up his conception of the vision of God, a passage which admirably illustrates the wide and controlled humanism for which his whole argument has paved the way:

> 'So far then from being rare, the mystical experience is at once the commonest and the greatest of human accidents. There is not one of us to whom it does not come daily. It is only carelessness or custom that prevents our realizing how divine it is in essence; only timidity which checks us from proclaiming that we too at such moments have seen God, even as in a glass darkly; only folly which blinds us to the fact that these moments of vision are our surest safeguard and our best resource in every temptation, sorrow, or selfishness. In every such contact with whatever is true and honourable and just and pure and lovely and of good report the true Christian tradition allows, and indeed constrains, us to recognise the first trace of the vision of God. What Christianity offers, with its fellowship and Sacraments, its life of prayer and service, its preaching of the Incarnate Son of God, is

the same vision in ever-increasing plenitude; vouchsafed in such measure as will avail against the worst temptations, the deepest sorrow, the most ingrained self-seeking, and will give constant and daily increase of strength, encouragement, and illumination.'

Oriel College, Oxford. L. W. GRENSTED.

AN EASY WAY WITH RIDDLES.*

'There is a riddle in the New Testament. And it is a riddle neither of literary criticism, nor of date and authorship, nor of the historicity of this or that episode. The riddle is a theological riddle, which is insoluble apart from the solution of an historical problem. What was the relation between Jesus of Nazareth and the Primitive Christian Church? That is the riddle.' The problem is to recover the actual history of Jesus, for 'nowhere in the New Testament are events recorded and referred to simply as events. The events are set in a theological context and their record serves a theological purpose.' To this question these authors address themselves. The book is well-written and nicely printed; suggestive, stimulating, and provoking from start to finish. The two opening chapters on the language and text of the New Testament are excellent, if slight. For the rest, the chapters furnish a mass of considerations to be weighed by those who think the central problem has hitherto been settled, or that criticism has found either an authentic teaching of Jesus simple and ethical throughout, or that He himself was a homely and intelligible Figure until, with his original teaching, He was transformed by successive layers of interpretation and accretion. The authors' interpretation of evidence and their reasoning, though frequently provocative of disagreement, undoubtedly contain much that is important. If I confine myself to criticism of their treatment of the major issue, it is without any implication that the bulk of the work can be dismissed as of no account.

The writers' intention is 'to display the critical method at work upon the New Testament documents,' and to give the ordinary reader 'an idea of what is being achieved behind the scenes in the sphere of Christian historical theology.' They say that it would be a misrepresentation of 'the modern living criticism of the New Testament to catalogue a number of conclusions and present them as the fruits of the critical method.' However, the reader will find that, in the authors' opinion, if this was the state of affairs before they wrote they themselves have brought it to an end; for their book 'ends confidently because the historical problem has been solved. The authors cannot pretend to regard their work merely as a tentative guess at a solution. They have been swept on, at times against their will, by what seems to them quite overwhelming pressure, since the evidence, when treated critically, seems almost to rush to a conclusion.'

A little more hesitation might possibly have revealed to them that they have paid practically no critical attention to the most serious problem, and that, so far from solving it, not a little of their exposition does no more than raise it in an acute form; in fact, suggests further grave doubts for the removal of which they offer little more than confident assertions which it should have been their business to attempt to justify.

The general result which they claim for their work is to have shown that not only in the Synoptic Gospels as they stand, but also in their sources, 'the history of Jesus of Nazareth was already a highly-interpreted history, interpreted through the medium of the Old Testament. Moreover,

* *The Riddle of the New Testament.* By Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, Bart., and Noel Davey. (London: Faber and Faber, Ltd. Price 10/6.)

in the material, the actual history was conditioned by the interpretation.' And again, 'Not only is the Christology present in the various strata of the tradition, but the whole material is controlled by it.' If criticism could find a Gospel source of which this was not true, the riddle might be insoluble: as it cannot, the ministry, claims and teaching of Jesus must be regarded as having been, as real history, in all essentials what they are recorded to have been. 'Is the Jesus of history wholly submerged in the New Testament, or does that history rigorously control all our New Testament documents?' They have no doubt. My criticism is not that they are necessarily wrong, but that they offer no adequate reasons why anyone should believe that they are right; or even that such a rigid alternative correctly states the problem.

The authors attempt to show that the Gospels, alike in sayings and narrative, everywhere contain subtle allusions to the Old Testament, and that without a recognition of them no true understanding is possible. For example, the story of the young man (*Mk.* xiv, 51) who fled away naked at the arrest of Jesus is not merely historical reminiscence; Amos had written that 'he that is courageous among the mighty shall flee away naked in that day, saith the Lord.' Similarly Mark's short summary of the Temptation is obviously intended to recall Psalm xci, 11—13, and the linking of the Temptation with the descent of the Spirit as a dove upon Jesus is held to echo (what insight is required to recognise it!) the words of the Psalm: 'He shall cover thee with his pinions, and under his wings shalt thou take refuge.' Again, the Marcan narrative of the stilling of the storm and the calming of a frenzied man 'reproduces the sequence and movement' of several passages cited from the Psalms—all of which, and much more, is quite intentional on the part of the Evangelist. 'There is more here than a mere record of two episodes in the life of Jesus in their correct chronological order.' If these authors are right it is indeed so: the only question is—though for their general position it is the fundamental one with which they never grapple—whether it is *at all* a record of two actual episodes! If, as they argue, that 'concerning the origin of belief in the Virgin Birth the critical historian can say nothing,' how can they themselves say anything as to the true historical facts about Jesus, seeing that they show the records to be shot through and through with the same characteristics as the Virgin Birth stories? They may, perhaps, have it either way, but they cannot have it both.

Their contention is not merely that the Evangelists, on their own initiative, have so related the stories as to connect them subtly and intimately with the Old Testament, but that throughout Jesus himself similarly determined his actions and sayings. The trouble is that they have shown it necessary to go further, for if certain events are historical, the various factors contributing to them occurred with extraordinary convenience to this same motive. The significance of the healing of the deaf man who stammered (*Mark* vii, 31-37) is only to be understood by reference to the Old Testament, for 'stammerer' occurs only once in the New Testament and once in the LXX, 'the tongue of the stammerers shall speak plainly.' The same background controls the relation of the stories of the man with the withered hand and of the sick of the palsy. Even Jesus' use of the hand in healing seems intended to fulfil the common Old Testament metaphor: 'Though he fall, he shall not utterly be cast down; for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand'; and on the same basis the words, 'If I by the finger of God,' become very significant. The walking on the sea may have reference to the God who 'treadeth upon the high places (waves) of

the sea,' and so on. These authors recognise that 'it may be Mark who has, under some influence or other, complicated the story of Jesus of Nazareth,' and even that 'the whole conception might well be that of Mark,' but if so, they argue, this fact has not only affected his narrative but has created sayings too. They seem strangely blind, or indifferent, to the fact that their own arguments make this *by far the most likely hypothesis,* for they give no reasons why, or at what point, their application should be limited. For if it be merely phenomenally convenient that a young man should have fled away naked at the arrest of Jesus, and have thus exemplified the not at all clear parallel in Amos, it is quite incredible that the disciples should have actually spoken to Jesus in terms containing similar Old Testament allusions. Yet these writers argue that such words as 'Master, carest thou not that we perish?' have clear reference to Psalm xliv, 23*f.* : 'Awake, why sleepest thou, O Lord? Arise, cast us not off for ever. Wherefore hidest thou thy face? And forgettest our affliction and oppression?' Such argument may well be thought fantastic, but if it holds, is it not equally likely that the same motive which created such sayings may equally well have created them and attributed them to Jesus—particularly as the experience of the Resurrection appearances joined with the imagery of apocalyptic eschatology goes far to account for the Evangelists' Christology? Is it then equally likely that speeches suffused with extremely subtle Old Testament allusions were actually uttered by Jesus and correctly remembered and transmitted by disciples who, at the time, utterly failed to appreciate their significance? At any rate, here is a problem which should be tackled before giving oneself over to the confident affirmations of this book. Using such arguments, can the authors afford to regard, as they do, the problems of the date and authorship and provenance of the Gospels in their present form as 'mere questions' which 'seem to be irrelevant'?

Not a few of their assertions are as sweeping as the reasoning on which they rest is precarious. That 'no single incident in His life, or fragment of His teaching, if it be isolated from its context and detached, can be rendered intelligible, even if it be judged to be historical' requires vastly more proof and of a less fantastic sort than is here offered. They allow that the Marcan story of the cursing of the fig-tree may be the result of the turning of parable into fact; if so, to describe the Lukan parable as 'meaningless apart from His claim to utter such judgment with sovereign and effectual authority' suggests that meaning is only to be recognised where it is obscure. Any of the prophets could have uttered it: in itself it implies no kind of Christology. In accordance with the fashion of the type of criticism by which they have been so largely influenced, they minimize the originality of the ethical teaching of Jesus: 'There is no single moral aphorism recorded as spoken by Jesus which cannot be paralleled, and often verbally paralleled, in Rabbinic literature.' But what a wilderness of rubbish has to be searched to discover the parallels! Yet they are all within the thin Gospels. Is originality in moral teaching only to be seen in the utterance of what is wholly new and therefore as probably unsound as certain to be widely rejected? Does it not rather consist essentially in a change of emphasis and a clarifying of principles such as endow current conceptions with new life and compelling power? And has the Christological imagery no parallels? If the teaching, as such, is minimized, on what grounds can the Christological claims be shown to be justified? For few things are more probable than that the original disciples might have been led to acknowledge them on grounds which would certainly not

convince us. Again, these authors do not appear to recognise that if the bulk of the material is shot through with interpretation, *any* which does not obviously contain it becomes of infinitely more importance in any attempt to arrive at the original history. Merely to assert that there is no such material will not do. This book is not exhaustive, and much that would have been examined in a larger work is necessarily omitted; but then, the confidence about the solution should also have been omitted. The early chapters of *Acts* have something very relevant to contribute. The Lukan references to the death of Jesus and its significance may or may not be capable of harmonisation with, say, those of St. Paul, but they are not identical. The authors of this book note that *Acts* places in St. Paul's mouth the command to the Ephesian elders to 'feed the Church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood,' but they do not note that the language and style of this speech show it to be far more Pauline than any other of the speeches attributed to Paul in *Acts*, or that its conception of the significance of the death of Christ would appear either not to have been appreciated, or possibly rejected, by St. Luke, alike in the Gospel and *Acts*. They could most reasonably argue that the New Testament shows no striking differences in the attitude of the various writers towards the person of Christ, but there is an unmistakeable impression that the New Testament writers are searching current and sometimes ancient ideas and imagery in order to set forth His significance more clearly; and the ideas do not form any systematic unity. Very much more detailed and more critical examination is necessary before the authors of this book would be justified in stating that the Synoptic Gospels show no evidence of a number of ideas about Jesus in the early Church. Even if they are right in detecting so many far-fetched Old Testament allusions, these are not in themselves of obvious significance for the all-important attempt to arrive at what Jesus understood the Messianic office to mean; for nowhere is such influence more obvious than in the Temptation story, where it is introduced only in order that the kind of interpretation which these authors find so often present in the narratives and sayings, and regard as of primary importance, may be decisively rejected. They regard their results as 'inconvenient' because they do nothing to bring the New Testament 'within the orbit of modern humanitarian or humanistic teaching.' That is the least serious inconvenience. Their satisfaction that criticism cannot find a primitive, wholly ethical, untheological gospel is obvious. But of what use is that negative satisfaction when it is established by arguments which tend to remove the only grounds whereon the belief of the Church, alleged to be everywhere present in the Gospels, can be judged in respect of its historical basis to have been justified? What is required are *positive* grounds for thinking that the Church did not, in important matters, unhistorically read back her own interpretation into the life of Jesus.

The younger of these collaborators, without asking whether the presuppositions of certain other critics may not rest upon considerations more relevant than a supposedly disinterested shuffling of the contents of ancient documents, has suggested that New Testament critics may possibly have more to teach the secular historian than to learn from him. This book suggests that the first lesson might be a reminder that when a problem is intractable to scientific historical method, it may after all be settled by simply affirming the most desirable solution! That the Gospels reflect the interpretation of the facts about Jesus is no new discovery; but arguments which do no more than show that it is more extensive than was supposed do not solve the historical problem, but either leave it where it was, or

complicate it. The authors' own words about the work of others can be aptly applied to their own : they do ' no more than show that the interpretation was imposed on the ministry at an earlier period in the history of Christian piety than older critics supposed.' J. S. Bezzant.

JESUS CHRIST AND CONTEMPORARY POLITICS: A REVIEW OF DR. EISLER'S NEW BOOK.*

It is a long time since any book on the origins of Christianity has raised issues of such far-reaching importance as this. The heavy price of this large and learned volume is likely to prevent it from securing a wide circulation ; nor is it a book to be lightly skimmed, for it is typically German in its mass of heavy detail, and its disdain for all devices which make the casual reader's work less onerous. Moreover, even among the readers who might survive these tests, some will probably put it aside, because the conclusions reached by the author are seriously disturbing to many traditional ideas, and at the same time they are such that they are not easily answerable, except by scholars with unusual technical knowledge. Nevertheless, the book is one which merits careful attention, and that not only by professional scholars. For its conclusions are not merely of academic interest; if they prove to be well-founded, they have a bearing upon the whole position and claims of Christianity in the modern world, and not least in modern India.

The main theme of the book may be summarised as follows :—

1. It is well known that the extant Non-Christian Literature of the time of Jesus Christ contains very few references to the historic events recorded in the New Testament. Among these references probably the most famous is the testimony of the Jewish historian ' Joseph,' better known by his Latin name of ' Josephus ' ; but even these are brief, and throw very little additional light upon the origin of the Christian Movement.

For many years past, Dr. Eisler has devoted himself to a study of some little-known translations of the works of Josephus, which have been discovered in Eastern Europe, and particularly to the old Russian translations in the Slavonic dialect. He has found that in this translation the text of Josephus contains a great deal of additional matter which is not found in the Greek Texts hitherto known in Western Europe. An elaborate account of this and other non-Greek translations of Josephus is given in Chapters V, VI, VII and VIII of this volume (pp. 74-182), with a series of illustrations of manuscripts in question. Dr. Eisler believes that these hitherto unknown passages are not ' interpolations,' added to the original text by later translators, but are translations of passages which originally stood in the manuscripts as written by Josephus himself. These passages (he maintains) were deliberately deleted by censors, in the fourth and fifth centuries of the Christian era, acting under instructions of the Emperors from Constantine I to Valentinian III (325—477 A.D.), who were urged to take this action by the authorities of the Christian Church, because these passages contained phrases which were considered ' irreverent ' by the Christians of those days. This additional matter, which deals with events connected with the story of Jesus, is quite considerable in bulk, covering about eight pages of printed matter. Dr. Eisler considers that these passages are based upon material which is of early *date* and of high historic value, drawn in part from *Acta Pilati*, the official report which Pilate the Pro-

* *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist.* By Robert Eisler, Ph.D. English Edition by A. H. Krappe, Ph.D. (Methuen & Co., London, 1931. 42/-.)

curator of Judaea sent to the Imperial Headquarters at Rome, containing his account of the trial and death of Jesus of Nazareth at Jerusalem.

2. If Dr. Eisler's estimate of these passages is accepted, conclusions follow of very deep interest and importance:

(*a*) In the first place, some of these passages refer to the physical appearance of Jesus Christ, who is described in terms which suggest that, like his famous follower St. Paul, He was in bodily appearance far from impressive. The description, as critically reconstructed by Dr. Eisler, runs as follows:—

> 'At that time also there appeared a certain man of magic power—if it is meet to call Him a man, whom certain Greeks call "a son of God," but His disciples, "the True Prophet," who is supposed to have raised dead persons and to have cured all diseases. Both His nature and His form were human; for He was a man of simple appearance, mature age, dark skin, short growth, three cubits tall, hunch-backed, with a long face, a long nose, eyebrows meeting above the nose so that the spectators would take fright; with scanty beard, but having a line in the middle of the head, of the fashion of the Nazaraeans, and with an undeveloped beard.'[1]

Two explanations of such a passage appear to be possible: either it was maliciously inserted by some enemy of Christianity, in order to bring contempt upon the figure of its Founder; or else, as Dr. Eisler suggests, it represents the genuine text of Josephus, written indeed in an unfriendly attitude towards the Christians and their Master, but still expressing the current impression and tradition of Josephus' own day with regard to the external appearance of Jesus Christ. If the latter explanation should be true, it is certainly easy to see that the authorities of the Church would never have allowed such a passage to remain uncensored, but would have taken every care to see that it was deleted from all manuscripts that came under their notice; though there are also a few other stray references (collected by Dr. Eisler in Chapters XIII and XIV), which seem to reflect a similar tradition about our Lord's appearance. Dr. Eisler gives in his book several striking illustrations of pages from manuscripts in which certain passages have been actually deleted by the censors, sometimes by careful erasing, and sometimes by the rough and ready method of spreading ink broadcast over the offending passage.[2]

(*b*) A second conclusion and one which is even of greater importance follows from Dr. Eisler's contention that the testimony of the 'Slavonic Josephus' is on the whole reliable, and it is this: That both John the Baptist and Jesus of Nazareth were in their own day regarded, both by the Jews and by the Roman Imperial authorities, as much more closely connected with Revolutionary Jewish Nationalism than would be gathered from the pages of the New Testament or from the traditional interpretation of the New Testament story by the Christian Church.

On the basis of this new evidence, Dr. Eisler presents us with a picture of Judaea in which the seething of Jewish Nationalist Unrest plays a large and even a dominant part. From the time of Herod the Great (who died in B.C. 4) the Roman Imperial authorities, assisted by native Jewish princes, whom they had appointed with the title 'King of the Jews,' had been, as it were, 'sitting on the lid' of a boiling cauldron of revolutionary nationalism, which kept breaking out again and again in a series of revolts which were of far more than local significance, for indeed they represented the

[1] Eisler, pp. 424—427.

[2] Plates VI, VII, VIII, XI and XIII.

spear-head of the attack of the Orient against the Occident (Eisler, pp. 562—568). One of the leaders of this movement was Johanan ben Zakariah, a priestly revolutionary who summoned the Jewish peasantry around him, and invited those who dedicated themselves to the cause of their nation's liberty and salvation to be baptized, as a sign of their pledge to the New Cause, and its ideals of righteousness and truth. This is the figure brought before us in the New Testament, as 'John' the Baptist, but shorn of much of his real political character. This John (or Johanan) was full of expectations of the coming 'Messiah,' who would be a national leader of the Jews, and bade the crowds look for 'one who should come after him, the latchet of whose shoes he (John) was not worthy to unloose.' John was naturally a 'marked man' in the eyes of the Roman Imperial authorities, and after a time he had to flee into the deserts, and live there a life of poverty and renunciation, as a wandering *sanyasi,* but still a great popular leader (Eisler, Chapter XI).

Into this political turmoil, at a somewhat later stage, comes another figure, Jesus of Nazareth; gentler than John and with a purer and nobler message, of *ahimsa* and non-violence, and simple trust in God; not sharing the military ambitions of many of his followers, and believing that these would lead only to disaster and failure; but yet sufficiently closely connected with the National Movement to incur the constant suspicion of all the upholders of law and order. Gradually there comes upon him the conviction that he is the destined Messiah-King, who is to save his people, and this conviction ripens into the further realisation of the terrible *truth,* that the only way by which the Divine Will could be fulfilled is through his own death, which will be followed by his rising to life again, and his return from heaven, as the Divine Judge and Viceroy of God, to rule over the Kingdom of God on earth.

In all these, there is much that reminds us of the famous 'Eschatological Theory' of Albert Schweitzer; but here it is enforced and illustrated by the passages of the *Slavonic Josephus,* which form the main theme of Dr. Eisler's book. A few of these passages may be quoted here, in order to enable the reader to judge the nature of the evidence upon which Dr. Eisler bases his somewhat startling theories :—

(1) The Reconstruction of the famous 'Testimonium' of Josephus, from his Jewish Antiquities.

In the traditional text, this passage runs as follows :—

> 'About this time arose Jesus, a wise man—if indeed he may be called a man, for he was a doer of marvellous acts, and a teacher of such men as receive the truth with delight. He won over to himself many Jews and many also of the Greek Nation. He was the Christ. When Pilate had sentenced him to the Cross, still those who before had loved him did not cease to do so; for he appeared to them on the third day alive again, as the Divinely-inspired prophets had told' (Eisler, p. 60).

Dr. Eisler considers that this passage represents a *revision* of the original text of Josephus, in the interest of Christian orthodoxy. And on the basis of the non-Greek translations of Josephus, he 'restores' the original as follows :—

> 'About this time arose a certain Jesus, a wizard of a man, if indeed he may be called a man . . . He was, in fact, a teacher of astonishing tricks to such men as accept the abnormal with delight. And he seduced

many Jews and many also of the Greek nation, and was regarded by them as the Messiah. And when Pilate had sentenced him to the Cross, still those who before had admired him did not cease; for it seemed to them that, having been dead for three days, he had appeared to them alive again, as the Divinely-inspired prophets had foretold.'[3]

A comparison of these two texts shows how (according to Dr. Eisler's theory) a passage which was originally unfriendly and somewhat contemptuous in its reference to Jesus had been altered by the modification of a few words and phrases into a passage which becomes a 'testimony' to the Divine authority of Jesus, such as the Christian Church would welcome in support of its own point of view.

Again, on page 97, Dr. Eisler quotes from a Hebrew translation of Josephus in which there occurs the following passage:—

'In these days there was much party strife
and great disputes in Judaea
between the Pharisees
and the robbers in Judaea
who followed Jeshuah,
ben Pandera, the Nazaraean,
who did miracles in Israel, until
the Pharisees overpowered him;
and hanged Him upon a pole.'

Dr. Eisler considers that Jeshuah (= Joshua = Jesus), the Nazaraean, is, in fact, Jesus of Nazareth, and that that passage shows that Josephus believed that the followers of Jesus belonged to a revolutionary Nationalist group whom the Roman Imperial Government regarded as 'robbers,' similar to the crowds which followed the Jewish rebel leaders Theudas and Judas, who are referred to by Gamaliel, in *Acts* v, 36, 37.

In Plate XIII, page 106, Dr. Eisler gives a photograph of a Hebrew manuscript in which the above passage has been first carefully blotted out by a censor, then re-written in the margin by a subsequent writer, and afterwards effaced again by a second censor—a striking piece of evidence of the policy of rigid censorship which was exercised by the Ecclesiastical authorities whenever they came across any phrase which might seem to connect the early Christians with a movement that might be regarded as politically dangerous.

(2) The 'New Evidence' with regard to John the Baptist.

On page 224, Dr. Eisler gives an English translation of some passages in the Slavonic Josephus, which refer to John the Baptist. He is described thus:—

'A man in wondrous garb, in countenance like a savage, who came to the Jews and allured them to freedom, saying: "God hath sent me to show you the way of the law by which you shall be freed from many tyrants." And when the people heard that, they were glad. And he did nothing else to them save that he dipped them in the stream of the Jordan, and let them go, warning them that they should renounce evil deeds. So would they be given a king, who would free them, and subject all who are insubordinate; but He himself would be subject to none. And when he was brought to Archelaus, and the learned Doctors of the Law had assembled, they asked him who he was. But when they threatened to torture him if he did not desist from these words and deeds, he said: "It is meet rather for you to desist from

[3] Eisler, p. 62.

your shameful work." Then Simon arose in wrath and said: "We read the Divine Books every day; but thou, only now come forth like a wild beast from the wood, durst thou teach us, and lead the multitude astray?' But John said: "I will not reveal to you the secret which is among you, because you desired it not." And he went away to the other side of Jordan.'

If this passage is genuine, it certainly throws fresh and vivid light on the background of the story of John the Baptist.

(3) The Trial and Death of Jesus.

Most interesting of all are the extracts relating to the trial and death of Jesus (pp. 384-385), from the Slavonic text of Josephus. The substance of this runs as follows:—

'At this time there appeared a man, if indeed it is fitting to call him a man . . . His works were divine, and he wrought miracles, wonderful and strong, but in many things he opposed the law, and kept not the Sabbath. Yet he did nothing shameful, nor any daring act, but only by his word he prepared everything, and many of the multitude followed after him, and hearkened to his teaching, thinking that thereby the Jewish tribes could free themselves from Roman hands . . . And when they had made known to him their will that he should enter the city and cut down the Roman troops and Pilate, and rule over us, he did not disdain us. And when the news of this was brought to Jewish leaders, they assembled together, with the High Priest, and said: "We are powerless to resist the Romans, but since 'the bow is bent,' we will go and communicate to Pilate what we have heard." And they reported to Pilate; and he sent and had many of the multitudes slain. And he held an Enquiry concerning that wonder-worker, and pronounced this judgment: "He is a malefactor, a rebel, covetous of Kingship." And they took him and crucified him.'

Dr. Eisler lays special stress upon the use of traditional Jewish imagery of 'bending the bow,' in preparation for battle (*cf. Psalm* xi, 2), as one which proves the genuineness of the passage, because it is a simile which would have been unintelligible in later ages, and is not likely, therefore, to have been invented.

Conclusion.

It is evident that only a scholar with specialised and technical knowledge could adequately undertake a criticism of Dr. Eisler's contentions and the evidence upon which they are based. But the plain reader, after glancing through the arguments and evidence as it is given in Dr. Eisler's book, will probably feel inclined to draw conclusions somewhat as follows:—

1. Dr. Eisler has established beyond reasonable doubt the fact that many non-Christian documents, bearing upon the early history of the Church, were censored by the authority of the Church in the fourth and fifth centuries, if they contained passages which were considered by the Church authorities to be irreverent or objectionable from the point of view of Christian orthodoxy. But whether in any particular case a passage which occurs only in an out-of-the-way document, such as the *Slavonic Josephus,* should be accepted as a genuine passage of the orthodox text, which has been fortunate enough to escape the censorship, or not, is a highly technical question, which can only be settled after very careful and critical examination of all the evidence. In other words, while Dr. Eisler has shown us that there is nothing inherently impossible in the theory

that the passages which he has thus brought to light *may* be genuine pieces of fresh evidence, it would be unwise for the average reader to be ready to accept them as genuine without any further critical study.

2. Dr. Eisler's type of scholarship is typically 'Continental' in its methods. He eschews all 'probabilities and uncertainties,' and deals only in dogmatic affirmations and dogmatic denials. His method of reconstructing history often seems arbitrary; for, in order to reach his theories, he sweeps aside all passages which stand inconveniently in his way, and leaves only those which fit in with his theories. His assertions will probably strike most English readers as far too confident, and he would be more persuasive if he were more willing to admit the possibility of error in his own theories.

3. But if, for the sake of argument, we admit that the evidence which he has adduced is at least of some value, and deserves serious consideration, what, then, is its bearing upon the Christian Faith and Practice?

(*a*) With regard to the passages which suggest that the bodily appearance of our Lord was unimpressive and marked by weakness—this will doubtless come to many devout Christians as a shock, and their first inclination will be to reject such a theory as irreverent and incredible. Yet perhaps further consideration will suggest that if it should be true that Jesus was physically weak, and lacking in comeliness of bodily appearance, this may even throw into stronger relief the amazing wonder of the powerful impression that His personality has made upon history. It has always been recognised that in the Cross there is this strange paradoxical mingling of squalor and splendour, and it need not be any *more* strange if we should be led to believe that the same paradox is to be seen even in the bodily appearance of our Lord. If so, it would be only one more illustration of the principle laid down by the great disciple of Jesus who speaks of himself as weak and contemptible in appearance: 'When I am weak, then I am strong' (*II Cor.* xii, 10).

A more serious challenge is raised by those passages which, according to Dr. Eisler's theories, suggest that the message of Jesus Christ was far more closely intermingled with politics than has commonly been supposed. Here it may be said frankly that if Dr. Eisler's theory were accepted in its entirety, it would offer almost insuperable obstacles to the historic faith of Christendom with regard to the person and character of Jesus Christ. For the figure of Jesus as it stands in Dr. Eisler's reconstruction seems to be inextricably connected with Jewish ideas that are (at most) of temporary significance. Moreover, the fundamental changes of policy which Dr. Eisler seems to attribute to Jesus Christ as He passed from one situation to another in the development of the political drama of the time, were very difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile with the real *consistency of principle,* which is essential if the figure of Jesus is to claim our unreserved loyalty. This is particularly the case with regard to Dr. Eisler's contention that Jesus, after *beginning* His work with the ideal of love and non-violence towards all, abandoned this later on, under the stress of failure and disappointment, and accepted the method of *armed revolt* against Rome as a regrettable necessity (p. 570). If this were so, then, while we should still be instinctively led to think of the resemblance between Jesus and Mahatma Gandhi (see Eisler, p. 568), we could not fairly maintain that the prophet of Nazareth has a stronger claim on the world's allegiance than the Ascetic of Sabarmati.

It is true that the figure of Jesus as reconstructed by Dr. Eisler is indeed not without a beauty, pathos and charm of its own. Dr. Eisler himself is by no means unconscious of this charm, and his book contains some

striking references to Jesus. In one passage he speaks of him as 'The great King who never reigned; the servant of the Lord who has yet left on all mankind an imprint compared with which those of all the great world-conquerors and world-destroyers, both before and after him, must be regarded as trifling and insignificant' (p. 35). In another passage he speaks of him as 'A man—if it is possible to call this regal beggar, glowing with faith in his God and filled with divine inspiration, this poor and crippled wandering workman, whose words have now for almost two millennia resounded through the world, by the same miserable name which designates also a human herd' (p. 568). Yet, in spite of this note of generous appreciation, we cannot disguise the fact that the figure of Jesus Christ as painted by Dr. Eisler has in it defects, weaknesses and errors which would make it impossible for such a figure ever to hold that central place in the devotion of mankind which Jesus Christ has held in historic Christendom.

But it should be noted that this reconstruction of Jesus Christ which Dr. Eisler puts forward is achieved only (as we have already indicated) by an exceedingly drastic handling of the evidence and by a somewhat ruthless dissection of the documents available, in order to remove from them all passages which did not fit in with this theory.

Probably most of us will not feel able to accept unreservedly Dr. Eisler's method or his conclusions. At the same time, even those who decline to go all the way with him may quite legitimately be led by his arguments to believe that the documents which he brings before us contain a considerable amount of valuable evidence which throws light upon the Gospel narratives. It is probably *true* that the Christian tradition has been inclined to under-rate the importance of the political background of the Jewish life at the time of Our Lord. Dr. Schweitzer enabled us to recover part of that background by his striking 'Eschatological Theory,' and, although only a few scholars to-day would accept Schweitzer's view in its entirety, a much larger number find themselves deeply indebted to him for illuminating many a dark passage in the Gospels, and for making the New Testament story in many respects more vivid and intelligible. It may well be that future generations will owe a similar debt to Dr. Eisler. Certainly he has shown that many incidents in the New Testament gain a new freshness and vividness if we read them in the light of the Great Jewish Nationalist struggle for independence, which Christian historians have so largely ignored. We may refer in that connection to his interpretation of John the Baptist's preaching as a 'Field sermon to fighting men of the Jewish Revolutionary forces' (p. 265); to his illuminating comments on the incident of the tribute to Caesar' (p. 330); to his comments on the policy of Jesus with reference to Non-violence and Non-resistance (p. 370), and to the dramatic symbolism of the story of Palm Sunday and the cleansing of the temple (pp. 478-489). Without in all cases accepting Dr. Eisler's explanations, we think that few readers of the New Testament will fail to gain a fresh and stimulating vision of the New Testament story from a perusal of Dr. Eisler's pages.

His book comes as a challenge, and as a challenge which in many quarters will be resented. But, like many other books which have been one-sided and in some respects unconvincing, it is likely to leave a permanent mark upon the trends of New Testament study and interpretation. Certainly it is a book which will cause all readers to think furiously, and, we hope, freshly, over some of the great problems of the origin of the Christian religion.

E. C. Dewick.

THE PARABLES IN MODERN DRESS.*

The Bible can hardly claim to have been fortunate in its recent illustrators. A conventional attitude towards the meaning and a timidity of execution have characterised those artists who have attemped the difficult task. Angels, here, have feared to tread. Mr. Thomas Derrick's book is a refreshing change to all this. His line drawings of five of the Parables are as fearless and modern (though never 'modernistic') in *technique* as they are deeply appreciative of the subject. The book is beautifully printed on tough white paper. On each page a few words of the text, in the Authorized Version, are illustrated by a pen-and-ink drawing. These drawings are vigorous sketches of present-day people, in the clothes and surroundings of ordinary Western Society.

As a work of art the book is unique. Mr. Derrick uses his nib with an amazing dexterity, and makes his economized lines tell in a way that the old Byzantines would have approved. And as for the 'content' of these drawings, it is not too much to say that they are a new contribution to the understanding of our Lord's words.

In all five parables the same standard is reached, the same vitally interesting grasp of the story is shown. Take that of 'The Unjust Steward.' Here the Steward himself as a type of nobleman's agent who is not only hard-headed but unscrupulous is unforgettable, and so is his aristocratic master. 'The Prodigal Son' and 'The Good Samaritan' have naturally given the artist his greatest opportunities. In the first the father is a great conception as he appears on page after page playing his different rôles.

And in the second, could there be any character more touching than that of the 'Good Samaritan' as he appears in the drawing which shows him sitting in perfect happiness by the bedside of the 'certain man' that he had befriended? It was a stroke of genius on the artist's part to make the modern counterpart of the Samaritan a Jew commercial traveller, fat and distinctly out at elbows.

In the fearless modernity of its spirit this volume reminds us of the Hon. James Adderley's *New Seed on Old Soil*—another illuminating exposition of the Parables.

R.G.

WHO'S WHO IN THE CHURCH?†

Some would describe our Anglican Communion as a branch of the Catholic Church; others would describe it as the Church of the English Nation at home and beyond the seas. Either way it is correctly described. *Crockford's Clerical Directory* presents it as a vast body of officials holding offices and enjoying emoluments of a most varied kind. The Anglican Communion may be, and doubtless is, spiritual in its origin and purpose, but it is also very plainly terrestrial not only in its activities, but in its possessions and organization. It owns and enjoys legal rights and vast material possessions, and for these it has to do homage to the civil authorities by accepting various restrictions on its freedom which some of our more Church-conscious members feel no 'self-respecting Church' ought to endure. The Act of Uniformity and *Crockford's Clerical Directory* are sorrowful reading for

* *The Prodical Son and other parables shown in pictures.* By Thomas Derrick. (Basil Blackwell, 1931. Price 7/6.)

†*Crockford's Clerical Directory* for 1931, published by the Oxford University Press. Price, ordinary paper two guineas, India paper three guineas.

such. They do not object to the Church possessing privileges and properties, but they do not like the thought of her doing homage for them to the State. If they regarded the State as a Divine Institution, as did St. Paul, if they could bring themselves to believe as did their spiritual forefathers that in rendering to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, they are rendering to God the things that are God's, their squeamishness might be relieved. We would prescribe a good dose of Crockford, regularly repeated, as the best remedy for their squeamishness. The Preface is remarkably antibilious. A robust, healthy, practical good sense permeates it. All that is of importance ecclesiastically in the year's doings is summarized and commented on. The tone of the Preface is magisterial and its *gravitas* worthy of an eighteenth century English bishop. We find ourselves invariably in agreement with its judicious decisions. We should dearly like to know who composes it. It is undoubtedly the *Genius Ecclesiae gentis Anglorum*, but in whom does it reside so eminently? That secret is known only to its august publishers, the Oxford University Press.

Churchmen and all Church officials particularly have reason to be deeply grateful for Crockford of 1931. It even excels its predecessors in compendiousness and convenience. It consists of over 2,000 closely-printed quarto pages in double columns—a monument of efficiency and neatness. Every public library and every church official ought to possess the Crockford of the current year. What more appropriate gift to the rural dean from the neighbourly clergy of his deanery than the annual gift of Crockford with the tacit understanding that the donors may have the privilege of consulting the volume *in situ* when necessity demands? H.D.A.M.

THE PROBLEM OF DECADENCE.*

'History dispassionately provides material for all parties,' says Mr. Milner. This seems to imply that in the pages of history the student will find what he wants to find. Mr. Milner, however, cannot be accused of wresting facts to prove a thesis, because he is almost tantalisingly cautious in committing himself. The portion of history which he examines is roughly Gibbon's period—the decline and fall of the Roman Empire; and the problem set is to discover, if possible, the causes of that decline. Mr. Milner inspects a series of apparent or probable causes, and is somewhat doubtful about each of them. In most cases they were not causes at all, but symptoms of some more deep-seated malady. He begins with the vice and luxury theory, and finds it untenable in its cruder forms and too often abused for homilectic purposes. Yet, at the same time, the decline which culminated in the collapse of the fifth century 'was caused by, or rather was the outward form of, something that took place in the soul of man.' Nor will Mr. Milner accept Nietsche's view, held also by the subtle and sapient Gibbon, that Christianity contributed the *virus* of decay. Yet, 'though the spread of Christianity cannot in fairness be made responsible for the downfall of ancient civilisation, there remains a strong suspicion that the two phenomena are in some way inter-related.' Similarly, with regard to political forms, whether despotic or democratic, these are but the outward expression of a state of mind'—symptoms, not causes.

Though admitting that 'the whole of the literature of the later Empire is full of the bitter cry of the taxpayer,' Mr. Milner holds that such financial

**The Problem of Decadence.* By Gamaliel Milner, M.A. (Williams and Norgate, 1931. Price 6/-.)

burdens as were imposed ' might have been cheerfully borne or courageously thrown off ' by a society which was not already torpid with decadence. Even the dole, and the public absorption in large scale amusements, were symptoms of ' a vast *ennui*.' People were too mentally inert for a vigorous interest in serious pursuits. Scientific research had died out, and ' it is a curious fact that the Roman Empire did nothing to explore the lands and seas which surrounded it. The Romans never took the trouble to ascertain whether Scandinavia was an island, or whether the Caspian communicated with the ocean . . . History, in the sense of the serious study of the past, hardly existed.' The Christians seem to have exercised a monopoly of intellectual activity—such as it was. Mr. Milner examines slavery, the birth-rate, the incidence of diseases such as the plague and malaria. ' It is possible that the plague (brought back by the armies after a successful campaign against the Parthians) had as great an effect in bringing about the dissolution of ancient society as had the Black Death, according to some authorities, in disintegrating the mediaeval world.' Nor was it the army, but the ' home front,' that let the Empire down. Even in the days of the Byzantine Caesars the Imperial forces ' remained the most efficient military machine in the world, as is shown by the campaigns of Belisarius and Narses in the sixth century.'

On the whole, Mr. Milner is inclined to take the view that a time comes when a civilisation begins to suffer from old age. ' Most students of history feel, though they would find it difficult to prove, that every civilisation has a life of its own, which is either on the upward or the downward grade.' ' An impartial examination will, we think, show that the talk about degeneracy in ancient and in modern times is not mere idle chatter, but that it really represents a side at least of the truth.'

In a very interesting chapter, ' The Modern Parallel,' Mr. Milner examines the belief that the modern world is treading in the steps of its predecessor, and is destined to a similar downfall. While not committing himself entirely to his own vaticinations, he indicates a somewhat gloomy prospect. The Victorian Age was the age of the Antonines; the Great War had its anti-type in the fight for the Purple which lasted from 193 to 197. On this computation, A.D. 1930 is the equivalent of A.D. 209—the age of confusion (beginning with the murder of Alexander Severus in 235) is still twenty-six years off. Thus, ' those who may reasonably expect to finish their course before 1956 may hope to pass their time in comparative peace, though the increasing pressure of the barbarians from without (Russian Bolsheviks and the coloured races), and increasing social disorder within, will make life uneasy for them. But the rising generation will witness such horrors as the world has never seen. Aerial and chemical warfare will destroy whole cities and blast whole countrysides. To national and perhaps racial struggles will be added class warfare. After thirty years and more of aimless slaughter and destruction, a strong man, or succession of strong men, will quell the anarchy and establish order, possibly under the aegis of a world-state. But the world which will emerge from the welter of confusion and chaos will be but the pale shadow of its former self. The educated classes will have been exterminated or expropriated during the universal war, and with them will perish the traditions of art and culture already decadent when it began. Terrified by the spectre of anarchy, men will accept with docility a despotic authority, and submit to have every detail of their lives regulated from above. After lingering on in a gradual decline for some two hundred years, modern civilisation will gradually die out and a new Dark Age will begin (*circiter* A.D. 2200).'

This is a cheerful prospect, but if it be true that in the fall of Rome 'vast cosmic forces were at work which frustrated the counsels of the wisest statesmen, and rendered nugatory the skill and valour of the greatest generals,' then we have to admit that when the tide begins to go out, you can only watch the ebb, and thank God that you will be dead before low-water mark is reached.

There is, of course, another alternative, which Mr. Milner does not mention, but it may be worth considering. That is that the Roman Empire itself was one vast outrage upon humanity; that it ruthlessly crushed out the racial diversities which make for human progress; in short, that it was a sort of vampire which sucked the blood of humanity until there was no more blood left to suck, and then it died itself, corrupting the world by its stench, which still lingers here and there where the winds of heaven have not blown it away.

Mr. Milner has written a book of fascinating interest.

J. C. HARDWICK.

ARCHBISHOP WILLIAM TEMPLE AT OXFORD.

There is a quality of conviction about the spoken word, when assisted by accent and gesture, which it is almost impossible to convey by means of the written word. But the *verbatim* reports of Dr. Temple's recent addresses* in St. Mary's, Oxford, have such a human, personal appeal that they achieve almost the impossible. They were taken down in shorthand at the mission services which he conducted there, and they preserve not only the colloquialisms in which they were originally phrased, but also something of the atmosphere of the Mission.

The eight addresses deal with various problems of Christian faith and life, and one is impressed by the way each one is developed. Dr. Temple has not only avoided the snags of the old arguments, but has also contributed a freshness of approach and of illustration which is often most illuminating. Some of his short epigrammatic statements focus the particular problem so well that they should act as useful stimuli to thought: *e.g.* 'It is just as much idolatry to worship God according to a false mental image as by means of a false metal image.' 'The deepest sins in the nature of most of us are sins that we have never discovered at all.' 'It is our duty for a great part of the day to forget God, because if we are thinking about Him we shall not be thinking whole-heartedly about our duty in the world.' 'The only object of using words in prayer is to fix your own thoughts, not to give information to God.'

The chapter on 'Is there a Moral Standard?' is particularly good. Dr. Temple insists that much of the confusion here arises because people attempt to find an inherent sanction in this or that rule or restriction before they have any clear idea of the *values* at which they are aiming. It is the latter which set the stage for the former. And in this connection he has some useful things to say about the use and abuse of conventions. We wish, however, that he had found time to develop a little more his theory of the relation between nations. Some remarks on p. 52 lead one to suppose that he defends the view, in some form or other, that what is morally wrong may yet be politically right. From his very compressed remarks it would be possible to justify a Machiavellian theory of Statecraft. However, we conjecture that many statements in the book are purposely provocative.

J.P.H.

**Christian Faith and Life.* By Wm. Temple, Archbishop of York. (S.C.M., 1931. Price 3/- and 2/-.)

CORRESPONDENCE

REVISION OF AIMS OF THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION. IMPORTANT NOTICE TO MEMBERS (1).

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

At the Annual General Meeting held on May 27th, 1931, a Committee was appointed to consider the re-drafting of the Aims of the Union, and to report to a Special General Meeting to be held on October 28th, 1931. This Committee has now met and drawn up the appended Revised Aims. I shall be glad, therefore, if you will kindly allow me to draw the attention of members of the Union to them.

In accordance with the decision of the Annual General Meeting, any proposed amendments to the Revised Draft must be sent to me in writing, and at the Special General Meeting those amendments alone will be considered. Such amendments must reach me not later than the 1st October, 1931.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a Special General Meeting of the Union will be held at the Church House, Westminster, on Wednesday, 28th October, 1931, at 3 p.m.

The Annual Public Meeting will be held in the Caxton Hall, at 8 p.m., the same day.

T. J. WOOD,
Organising Secretary.

THE CHURCH HOUSE,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1.
1st July, 1931.

PROPOSED REVISED AIMS OF THE M.C.U.

1. To affirm the progressive character of God's self-revelation, and the certainty that no truth can lead away from Him.
2. To proclaim Christ and His Gospel in the light of modern knowledge.
3. To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to re-examine her traditional dogmas, and when necessary to reject what is false and restate what is true.
4. To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5. To promote the historical and scientific study of the Bible, and to interpret its message in the light of such study.
6. To secure increased beauty in Church Services and the use of language not discordant with modern thought.
7. To study the application of Christian principles in public as well as in private life.
8. To assert the right and duty of the laity to take a due share in the government and work of the Church.
9. To maintain the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England and to foster fellowship and co-operation with other Christian Societies.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO MEMBERS (2).

In St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, by invitation of the Vicar, the Right Reverend Dr. David, Bishop of Liverpool, will preach a sermon, 'In Defence of Modernism,' on Sunday evening, July 19th, at 6.15 p.m.

THE BEST IN PAGANISM.*

Everyone, who has an interest either in the New Testament or in classical antiquity, knows what to expect from Dr. Glover. In this little book he is at his best. Dr. Glover knows so many picturesque details that he sometimes has let them obscure his main theme. It is not so here. The material is well built in. The chapters on Alexander (Ch. III) and on the Roman Empire (Ch. VI) are little masterpieces. On one topic only—the Jew—does Dr. Glover seem to lose the firmness of his touch. He leaves here just a suspicion of the amateur. Perhaps it is because he is inclined to exaggerate the influence of Hellenism on the Jew. It is this view that leads him to disparage apocalyptic literature (p. 102). It is true that St. Paul's success with Gentile converts is strong evidence of the exchange of influence between Jewish and Hellenic culture outside the borders of Palestine, but even there the impression on our minds is that the Jew influenced his pagan neighbour rather than the converse. It is one of the enigmas of Christian history how Christianity came to be dissociated so completely from its parent Judaism. Were those Hellenistic Jews, of whom Stephen is the type, much farther away from the Mosaic religion than has been recognised? It may well be that it was this liberal Judaism that became the foundation of Christianity, largely, but by no means solely, through St. Paul, the greatest of Stephen's converts. If that is so, it is easy to see how it comes about that, as Wilamowitz said, St. Paul became the unconscious Executor of the Will of Alexander. Christianity was successful over its rival schemes because it quickly hellenised itself and became an instrument of Hellenic rather than Hebraic culture. This is the view of primitive Christianity that Dr. Glover accepts. He gives a most attractive picture of the nobler features of paganism as Christianity met it.

It is not Dr. Glover's task to investigate the success or failure of that contact. Often failure must have predominated. The new Christian outlook owed so much to the Old Testament (with ways of thought that cannot be hellenised) that the Christian must more often than not have found himself in disunion even with the best elements of his environment. A casual reader of Tertullian finds himself near the prophet Ezekiel, but not very near Cicero. The Hellenic sense of the intellectual virtues met all too rarely an appreciation from a Clement or an Origen, but, as Dean Inge has argued, they only found an open field in Christianity after the Reformation. Still, they did find some affinity with Christianity even from the first. The earliest Christian apologists classed themselves with the philosophers, and even Tertullian is more rationalistic than he admits to himself. This, however, is wandering from Dr. Glover's subject. ' It is the thesis of this book that the best (*i.e.* in paganism) was very good indeed and that it was won for Christ ' (p. 9). It is a most attractive picture of the merits of that pagan civilisation. It will be read without skipping.

E. J. MARTIN.

**The World of the New Testament.* By T. R. Glover, pp. 191. (Cambridge University Press, 1931. Price 6/-.)

CORRECTION.

Read *Philo* for *Pluto*, p. 168, l. 43.

MARRIAGE AND MODERN NEEDS.

Two recent books* on marriage both deal with the problems of married life, but they do so from entirely different standpoints. Dr. Crichton-Miller deals, as might be expected, with the psychological aspect, and we might call his book 'The Psychology of Married Life.' It is, in substance, a lecture given under the auspices of the British Social Hygiene Council at the Annual Conference of Educational Associations. It is a very able lecture, but in spite of its ability it is an unsatisfactory book. It begins with the statement that 'the child who is free from fear is educable' and then proceeds to examine the kind of influences which are brought to bear on child-life either to assist or restrain freedom. And since parents cannot transmit freedom if they are under any sense of conflict themselves, many of the greatest problems affecting married life are included by Dr. Crichton-Miller in his analysis. For, in the Christian idea of marriage, he finds many causes of such conflict.

But Dr. Crichton-Miller developes his theme inadequately. We want to sympathise, but there is little to focus our sympathy. We want to sneeze, but nothing more than a tickle will come. Thus, while freedom is the keynote of the whole lecture, we are never told in what sense the author is using this term. There is a kind of freedom which is little short of license, and this

> 'Freedom is the sort of thing
> That don't agree with niggers.'

Nor with marriage either, for that matter. Hence we are left wondering why, in such an important thesis, Dr. Crichton-Miller never defined his term.

Mr. Pite, on the other hand, treats Christian marriage as an art. He believes that there are special lines along which the Christian can explore this art and master its problems. Hence, while he is interested only in those who want a definitely *Christian* view of marriage, his book is a simple but very practical discussion of the many issues and problems connected with married life, and he approaches these problems with sympathy and understanding. He discusses the current assumptions about marriage and deals with the implications of marriage as a partnership. He concludes with some consideration of birth-control and divorce. In view of his sympathetic treatment of problems in the rest of the book, it is a little surprising to come, in the last chapter, to a more restricted view. We will make our criticism by comparing two passages. Thus, that 'the re-marriage of the divorced is for the Christian . . . an impassable obstacle in the path of anyone who would follow Christ in the way of forgiveness to the end' (p. 117), seems to us a harsh judgement. A truer one is stated on a previous page, that 'the first thing to notice (about Our Lord's words on marriage) is not that such a union cannot be broken, but that it must involve the very closest and most inclusive of ties if the union is to be a real one at all' (p. 36). Where such a union is not achieved, it is less a marriage than a sham which is dissolved: and to close, for at any rate the innocent party, the possibility of finding this 'closest and most intimate of ties' cannot be in keeping with the spirit of Our Lord's words.

J.P.H.

**Marriage, Freedom and Education.* By H. Crichton-Miller, M.D. (S.C.M., 1931. Price 1/-.)

**Christian Marriage and Modern Practice.* By A. C. Pite, M.A., M.C. (S.C.M., 1931. Price 3/6.)

THE EVANGELICAL CASE FOR REUNION.

*The Call for Christian Unity** is a volume of essays contributed at the request of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement by eleven clergymen of the Church of England and one Presbyterian professor. The common mind that binds the writers together is expressed by the words of the Bishop of Dornakal, which appear on the fly-leaf:

> 'Unity may be theoretically a desirable ideal in Europe and America, but it is vital to the life of the Church in the mission field. The divisions of Christendom may be a source of weakness in Christian countries, but in non-Christian lands they are a sin and a scandal.'

As this quotation suggests, the question of unity and reunion is approached from the point of view of the Church's task in the world and the disability she is under in performing it, both at home and abroad, by reason of her 'unhappy divisions.' This approach determines the writers' views both on the kind of reunion to be sought and the most hopeful way of attaining it. They do not think of unity 'as something which chiefly concerns the well-being of the Church,' nor is it their aim 'to restore Church policy as it existed prior to the tenth century.' As the Rev. G. H. Harris, the Editorial Secretary of the C.M.S. puts it, 'The unity of the future must be the unity of the Church in the first hundred years of its existence. That unity consisted objectively in the proclamation of the one Gospel, and subjectively in the possession of the fellowship of the Spirit.'

The writers' practical interest also necessitates some salutary criticism, in regard to ends as well as means, of certain proceedings in the matter of unity with which we are familiar. Thus the writer quoted above says, 'Christian unity is not the preserve of hierarchies and conferences. It belongs to spiritual comradeship, not to ecclesiastical casuistry; it is the common ground of Christian men and women the world over.' In similar strain the Rector of Birmingham, whose subject is 'The Promotion of Unity at Home,' declares that 'the slight encouragement given to the reception of Nonconformists at the Lord's Table by the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference (1920) has proved wholly inadequate to meet the growing experience of unity. Quite rightly, popular feeling has attached far more importance to elasticity in this direction than to any rapid extension of interchange of pulpits.'

Because their interest is religious rather than ecclesiastical the writers display a greater awareness of the realities of the present situation and a truer grasp of the historical processes which have led up to it than have been commonly shown in the official but none the less academic discussions of reunion, of which we have had sufficient examples in the last few years. This is seen not only in the accounts given by Dr. Linton (the Bishop of Persia), Canon A. W. Davies (formerly of Agra), and a Chinese professor in the University of Wuchang, of the movements towards reunion in the countries with which they are most familiar; but to an equal extent in the essays by the Bishop of Worcester, Archdeacon Hunkin, Canon A. J. Tait, and others, whose historical surveys reveal the unsoundness of the foundations on which a narrowly-conceived and mis-named 'Catholicism' rests its case for imposing those rigid conditions, in the interests of 'Church order,' which are proving the greatest stumbling-block in the way of a reunited Church.

G. K. MacBean.

* *The Call for Christian Unity.* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1930. 7/6.)